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Here's an invitation from Keawaiki
To visit, relax and gather with others
To feast with the crowds of people
Beloved child of Hawai‘i
You are our chosen favorite

Hawaiian hospitality, that is, the traditional manner in which people are greeted, hosted and made to feel welcome in Hawaiian culture, is considered to be one the true tenets of the Hawaiian way of life. Somehow, ho‘okipa has managed to survive Lono’s return, several tragic epidemics, New England Missionaries, the Overthrow, an attack on Pearl Harbor, Don Ho and the Hawaiian Renaissance. And it just might make it through to Hawaiian sovereignty --perhaps beyond!

This research endeavors to understand the complexities of this idea by looking at the socio-political, cultural and historical evolution of Hawaiian culture. Indeed, over the last two millennia, much has changed in Hawai‘i including the Hawaiian people. But ho‘okipa is one of those central concepts that help to connect the English-speaking, car-driving, money-making, tax-paying Hawaiians of today with the incredibly rich and noble life style of their ancestors -- by no means a perfect world, but always hospitable.

* These lyrics were taken from the first verse of a song called, “Keawaiki” composed by Helen Desha Beamer. The composer’s very dear friend, Francis ‘I‘i Brown, invited her to a gathering at his beachside home at Keawaiki, Kona.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Background

The closest Hawaiian translation for the English word "hospitality" is ho'okipa, which literally means "to enable a visitation to occur," or "to be hospitable." The root word, kipa, without the causative ho'o-, means "to visit." Native concepts behind ho'okipa seem to center around "visitation" as a distinguished event. Historical accounts suggest that traditional hospitality was not simply an exhibition of etiquette nor an appropriate social nicety, it was a mandatory requirement of the culture. Whether as visitor or host, the fulfillment of certain obligations was expected. This, however, did not mean that hospitality was a rigid and stoic exercise. On the contrary, it was characterized by great emotional expression and sincerity. Noted contemporary Hawaiian historian, George Kanahele wrote: "The relationship between aloha, and ho'okipa is clear: hospitality flows from an out-pouring of aloha first, not the other way around." While the particular circumstances which dictated certain obligatory behavior varied from one situation to the next, it is clear that hospitality, or ho'okipa as a concept, embodied the social, political and religious codes of Hawaiian society and was not easily compromised.
Cultural images and expressions have been a primary focus of my job after serving almost ten years as the Department Head of Performing Arts at Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate (KSBE). The shapes and textures which we as an institution project on any given stage, (performance, academic or otherwise) are generally accepted as being “true, real and appropriate” manifestations of Hawaiian culture. In the eyes of the Hawaiian community, we have the authority to assert what is “authentic” and can also establish what is “trendy” or stylish. This authoritative role puts a tremendous amount of responsibility on Kamehameha to serve as a model and to lead the community both educationally and culturally. We are further challenged to reestablish, and even redefine Hawaiian cultural “truths” as they apply to the twenty-first century needs of Hawaiian learners today and of the generations to come.

I believe that many important “truths” about Hawaiian culture are deeply rooted in ho’okipa traditions. They consist of behaviors and practices which are tied to native perspectives of life and how the world works. The ways people treat each other and the expressions they offer to show respect and deference may be the true indicators of cultural revival: an evaluation of behaviors and perspectives as oppose to facts and figures. This thesis endeavors to explore ho’okipa as a new and meaningful approach to cultural curriculum, and supports the belief that cultural literacy and stability can serve as catalysts for the success of Native Hawaiians in contemporary society.
The "truths" which are passed on to the next generation will either strengthen or weaken the efforts toward cultural stability. Hence, there is reason to be concerned -- reason to be selective and fastidious about the cultural legacy we leave behind.

The main objectives of this discourse are to discuss hospitality as both a formalized process and as an ideology in Hawaiian culture. A range of historical references have been identified and analyzed in order to more clearly describe the various elements of the hospitality process. The intended outcomes of this overall research effort are to illustrate the prevalence of ho'okipa ideology in Hawaiian culture, and to present ho'okipa as a way of thinking which facilitated both the survival of Hawaiians and the productive operation of Hawai‘i’s complex society in pre-Western times.

Native Hawaiian identity has come to mean different things to different people over the last twenty some odd years of cultural revival. Many would agree that the movement peaked at the ‘Onipaa centennial observance of the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom in January of 1993. With Hawaiian sovereignty issues having gone from being radical rhetoric to mainstream dialogue in such a short period of time, and in light of the ongoing growth and development of Hawaiian identity, it seems fair to assume that cultural practices will only continue their upward trend and become even more prevalent in the years to come. Hence, this kind of cultural research can prove significant and meaningful, not only to the
Hawaiian community, but to all who endeavor to better understand and more affectively interact with Native Hawaiians.

As historical precedents are uncovered and reified in indigenous circles (and sometimes in the community as a whole), the benefits from learning about the past attitudes, perspectives and psyche of earlier Hawaiians increases in value and worth. Collectively, the community-at-large can gain insight into the social, political, religious and environmental realities of former times, which can bolster group-esteem among Native Hawaiians and can also impact the way we deal with the politically-charged cultural issues of contemporary Hawai‘i.

In the remembering and recording of history, both bards and scribes apprehend their own society’s ideas and intentions in ways that are intelligible and meaningful within their respective cultural and historical contexts. Any foreign or future attempts at cultural reconstruction are often done so without knowing the “rules of the game.” When this happens, there is often a sense of “detachment” or “distance” in efforts to interpret both “the past” and “the foreign.” One way to meaningfully bridge, or at least bond related cultural topics and subjects together is by introducing a central social process or institution which serves as a focal point towards which a multiplicity of cultural ideas gravitate in a natural and contextually authentic manner. 4 Ho‘okipa, is one such concept in Hawaiian cultural history. It consists of a diverse range of aspects and conditions which together constitute
the hospitality process. Rather than address the “hows and whys” of divorced cultural aspects, like “food” or “religion,” one is challenged to identify a dynamic central context which illustrates several connected ideas in motion. For example, while this study is essentially about Hawaiian hospitality, it is also about social institutions, politics, class, gender, belief systems, psyche, food, rituals, chants, views of life, and more. These ideas, when re-attached in context, have greater meaning. Hawaiian hospitality in this regard, is truly valuable as a historical record of Hawaiian lifestyle -- a functional context within which a host of cultural ideas hang cogently together.

Sometimes, a sense of “timelessness” pervades the discussion of the ho’okipa process. References to hospitality can be found in folkloric accounts, historical records as well as contemporary situations. This can be problematic in that history is normally framed, if not bound by a sense of time and sequence. However, if ho’okipa becomes understood as more of an ideology, that is, a way of thinking that contributed to community survival, rather than as a mere event or activity, its sense of “timelessness” might be more acceptable. Although cultures evolve over time, they are also capable of consciously maintaining certain ideals that have special meaning. These we might call “traditions.” Ho’okipa is one such ideal, a tradition which may have changed in shape and texture over time, but whose spirit has remained intact over centuries.
Many of the examples cited in this text are clearly located in time. They have been drawn from memoirs and accounts which were specifically documented at certain moments in history, or which conspicuously occurred in proximity to recognized historical events. Other references are either ethnographic or traditional in nature and come from sources that seem indifferent to time periods. For example, Mary Puku'i presents a wealth of information remembered from her childhood in Ka'ū, Hawai‘i. She, in typical Hawaiian style, was influenced greatly by the grand folk, that is, the grandparent generation of her extended family -- people who were born at least two generations before her. Puku'i was born in the mid-1890s, therefore some of her grand folks might have been born in the 1840s, if we allow 25 years per generation. Many of her grand folks had been raised by their grand folks who may have been born sometime around the 1790s. The same circumstances existed for Puku'i's numerous interviews with dozens of “old-timers” in the 1930s and 1940s, during her tenure at the Bishop Museum. The amount of information she managed to recover was massive and much of it can be traced back to pre-Western times. Hence, when Puku'i speaks, she does so authoritatively; she brings with her the collective wisdom of centuries. However, her contributions may be often devoid of references to historical time, thereby creating a sense of a “timeless ethnographic present.” This is not necessarily a problem. For example, certain timeless Jewish ideologies bring meaning to Biblical accounts of the Hebrew experience, but
also help to explain the lifestyle and perspectives of contemporary American Semitic communities some 4,000 years later. Perhaps this is analogous to the case of Hawaiian cultural history. Whether clearly indicated, or vaguely implied, it is important to know that all examples in this text were selected because in the opinion of the writer, they retain certain traditional attributes which may be linked to pre-Western Hawaiian life and values.

"Hospitality" is not recognized as a conventional topic in anthropology. However, when deconstructed, its parts can be analyzed in social scientific terms. William Sumner, an early American sociologist, coined the term "folkways" which was defined as "patterns of interaction and structure that built up and persisted over years of coping with social situations." Ho'okipa is indeed a Hawaiian "folkway." Patterns were created by hosts and visitors to deal with survival issues away from home. The practice became "institutionalized," as evidenced by its universal observance by all classes from Hawai'i to Ni'ihau. Eventually, people became concerned over their status and the ways in which it became raised or lowered through the processes of interaction and exchange. A hallmark figure in cultural anthropology, Ralph Linton, described "status" as either an ascribed or achieved social position which is recognized for the purpose of engaging in meaningful social interaction. One's particular status in ho'okipa obligated him or her to the enactment of a particular litany of behaviors and rituals. Linton defined these activities as "roles." Over the course of time, mainstream American
anthropologists grew more receptive to ideas of alternative social forms. Margaret Mead's work among pre-literate Oceanic peoples presented new thoughts about human interaction which challenged the established definitions of "normality." Mead's ground-breaking views on socialization, seem willing and able to accommodate the idea of hospitality being "mandatory" within Hawaiian society, in comparison to its function as a "courtesy" within Western society.

Western scenarios of provincial hospitality ranged from that of the weary traveller who was grateful to find warmth in some rustic barn for the night, to the southern officer who was invited to a bountiful table at some Louisiana plantation. In recent times, affluent circles heed the wisdom of Amy Vanderbilt and Letitia Baldridge who view hospitality at its finest, as an issue of how to properly fold a serviette or where to place the dessert silver. Hospitality is indeed among the most revealing exhibitions of a society's attitudes and values.

Today, any discussion of "tradition" in academic discourse begs for some allusion, if only momentary, to the theories and concepts which claim it as an "invention" rather than as a "legacy from the distant past." Essentially, many anthropologists assert that societies are constantly manipulating symbols and reinterpreting their past in terms of the present. As a result, all claims of authenticity and traditionalism are held as spurious and are often discredited, or even dismissed as politically-motivated strategies
which are attached to agendas of nationalism. More will be said later on in this chapter. However, at this point, it may suffice to recognize and understand that "insiders" and "outsiders" often perceive the same issues in totally different ways, which helps us to be more cognizant that other sets of "truths" and other ways of "knowing" exist. All things in the world need not agree all of the time, to be of value. This is certainly true in discussions of culture, identity and tradition.

**Resources and Methodology**

Conventional approaches to history, as alluded to earlier, tend to accommodate topics that are usually framed by dates, events and figures. These elements help to shape and define the specific "unknown" that is being researched. By virtue of implied contexts and associations that are based on established historical beliefs and understandings, the researcher is usually able to discern a sense of direction for his or her study. For example, whether one desires to study the social impact of *opera buffa* in eighteenth century Europe, or American feminism in the 1960s, there are a number of leads which point toward specific time periods, particular places and events, and recognized historical figures -- the researcher has good ideas about where to seek information. And, in many cases, the topic has been alluded to, if not already fully addressed in some shape or form, by other researchers.
Such is not the case with regard to ho’okipa. Due to the lack of serious research in this area to date, one is first tasked with establishing that such a construct exists. By recognizing its crucial connection to the socio-politics of traditional times, ho’okipa takes on a “legitimate” dimension which gives it a tangible quality in the realm of research. As a social mechanism, it can be understood in terms of cause and effect relationships and can be seen as a product or by-product of social interaction. Secondly, examples of ho’okipa must be identified in cultural and historical contexts. A number of ho’okipa situations from diverse sources must be compared and contrasted; they must be juxtaposed to determine their similarities, differences and unique conditions. And finally, it must be explained in finite terms that substantiate it historically, anthropologically or sociologically -- that is, if one is acting within a social scientific arena. In other words, it must be deconstructed, labeled, analyzed and reconstructed. This allows for the topic to be discussed in academic terms which is crucial to scholarly understandings of Hawaiian social processes. This is not meant to imply that ho’okipa is completely comprehensible in the absence of cultural “truths” and ways of “knowing” such as spirituality; it most certainly is not. But to identify it as a valuable topic in academic research, it must stand up along side other similar topics, and be able to project a certain amount of fullness and depth as well as be subject to standard kinds of treatments. This approach is not an attempt to make ho’okipa “legitimate” or “credible” as a cultural entity worthy of
research. Indeed, it already holds that distinction inherently. Instead, it is a
means by which the topic is made “research-able” in cultural-historical terms.

Because ho‘okipa is a “social process,” hundreds of references exist
which range from stories of Pele, the fire goddess, which are centuries old, to
contemporary interviews with kūpuna. The researcher’s challenge has been
to recognize the process of ho‘okipa as it appears in the accounts. There is
seldom any clear statement up front to alert the researcher of its presence;
there are only hints, such as, the occasion of a major war, implications made
in the epic travel log of Hi‘iaka, certain hula traditions, etc.

With the exception of a pamphlet published by the Office of Hawaiian
Affairs in 1988 entitled, Ho‘okipa: Hawaiian Hospitality, and an affective yet
brief treatment by George Kanahele in Kū Kanaka: Stand Tall, no single effort
has been identified that expressly addresses ho‘okipa. Abraham Fornander’s
collections of traditional stories and Nathaniel B. Emerson’s work on the Pele
and Hi‘iaka epic serve as excellent nineteenth century folkloric resources.
Kaona, or veiled innuendo, among other poetic devices, helped to preserve
native sentiments of hospitality through chants that were presumably
performed in former times. In most cases, Fornander’s “researchers” were
Native Hawaiians who collected stories and verse in the native tongue from
country-dwelling oldsters. His collections are by far the largest of their kind.
In most cases, its direct links to pre-Western antiquity are clearly established
and serve as the most valuable evidence for the “hospitality ideology” in
traditional culture. His great passion for Pacific peoples and their cultures is evident in his attempts to connect them together, along with the Hebrews, into a single "perfect puzzle" of Pacific humanity. This effort, and the conspicuous similarities between biblical accounts and his Kumuhonua traditions, have caused some to consider him and his theories as eccentric and misguided. Still, his anthologies are significant pillars in Hawaiian scholarship. Emerson's work is also praiseworthy, especially by those who aspire to hula traditions today. Albeit Victorian in flavor, Emerson's recording of hula rituals, lyrics and background information as well as his capture of the epic travels of Hi'iakaikapiopele, sister of Pele and hula patron, form the backbone of the early scholarly corpus on traditional Hawaiian performing arts. Allusions to elements of ho'okipa are frequently described by its author whose overall scholarship reveals the finesse and competence of his New England schooling, and yet, holds fast to the Hawaiian folk ways in which he was immersed as a child, being born and raised in mid-nineteenth century Waialua, O'ahu. The method of extracting useful information from these folkloric sources involved tedious reading and reviewing. The specific passages were selected because they were clear in their purpose and intent.

The experiences of explorers and their crews have also proven invaluable. Early descriptions of initial encounters between foreigners and Hawaiians are revealing in their depictions of cultural collision and
colonialism. Captain James Cook's arrival and demise in Hawai'i has been an interesting subject for analysis. Marshall Sahlins and Gannath Obeyeskere offer much regarding the religious and socio-political motives for events surrounding Cook's visit; some of which appear to be implications of ho'okipa. There is certainly much to be said regarding the interchange between natives and explorers with regard to hospitality. Foreign ships brought desirable goods from afar, which, upon becoming valued items of exchange, contributed to a shift from indigenous concepts of "interdependent sharing" to Western "trading." Increasingly entangled by political ambitions, a series of transformations developed in terms of meanings of, and motives for, hospitality. Explorers continued their bold passage across the cultural boundaries of their hosts until, over time, the native world gave way to the foreign.

Beachcombers, on the other hand, were foreigners who were largely accepted by the native community and its leadership. They operated comfortably within the traditional social structure of the host culture. Largely, they did not possess high status and did not have access to the kinds of foreign goods desired by the locals. The accounts of the virtually unknown, John Whitman, serve as a good example of a foreign view that was not necessarily caught up in the politics of high status exchange. Elements of ho'okipa have been recorded in his experiences.
Missionary accounts have been revealing in the ways natives treated the New England clergy as they went preaching from place to place. Before 1820, depopulation was horrendous and the religious institutions of high temple worship had collapsed. And yet, especially in the country areas, Hawaiian practices continued. While missionary pioneer, the Rev. Hiram Bingham, recorded his disdain of "heathen debauchery" in Honolulu in the 1820s, the Rev. William Ellis recorded his observation of the genteel hospitality and generous bounty prevalent at Wai'ōhinu, Ka'ū. The latter also recorded in vivid detail, the social interactions of Hawaiians and their values. Collectively, missionary accounts provide numerous descriptions of hoʻokipa because their work required them to travel and because they had to live among the people. Further, generosity through hospitality was considered to be a Christian act of kindness, and therefore, a virtue to which they might typically aspire.

It is not surprising that the history of Hawai'i has been largely recorded by non-Hawaiians. This is not, in itself, a problem. It is the low representation of native-remembered and native-told histories that pose concerns. In recent times, this appears to be changing due to the resurgence of interest in the culture and the increased emergence of educated Hawaiian scholars who are inspired and equipped to take on the task. Another side to this issue, however, is the fact that indigenous Hawaiian histories do exist in the form of Hawaiian newspapers; volumes of which are left untranslated.
and shelved at the State Archives and the Bishop Museum. As a result, we have come to depend heavily on David Malo, John Papa 'I'i and Samuel Kamakau for nineteenth century native perspectives of Hawaiian history. They are indeed major pillars upon which contemporary understandings of the Hawaiian past rest. Their recollections of hospitable acts and circumstances confirm the practice of *ho'okipa* in historical terms. They are primary resources; in many cases, practitioners and participants in the subject under investigation. Their inbred attachment to native belief systems allow them to describe the nuances and respond to *ho'okipa* situations in native terms. This adds considerably to the credibility of this work. Although some feel their Christian convictions sometime taint their reports of traditional culture on occasion, this is so in the recording of history everywhere, and does not, by any means, lessen the value and worth of their contributions. A twentieth-century counterpart, Lilikalā Kame'elehiwa, provides, what is considered by some to be among the first Hawaiian histories written by a Native Hawaiian in the twentieth century. In her work, she incorporates spiritual and sexual aspects of Hawaiian culture which help to fill the gaps left as a result of the earlier anxieties of foreign ideologies and mind sets. Her nationalistic agenda cannot help but frame her presentation of Hawaiian history with a rebellious tinge. Lilikalā articulates cultural nuances about how Hawaiians feel towards land, the duties of chiefs and the role of *pono*, or
"balance, rightness" in society. These cultural aspects help to uncover native attitudes towards food, the arts and social intercourse in general. 12

Research of the ho'okipa process is a study of cultural behavior; a code of conduct revealing the ideologies and survival mechanisms of early Hawaiians. Although it is seldom isolated for discussion in discourse, historical or otherwise, its apprehension makes for exciting and challenging historiography. It is important to note that the writer has selected from among the wealth of historical references to hospitality, only those examples which help to identify major ideas and concepts presented in this thesis. However, this selectivity reflects a range of contexts from folklore to contemporary accounts, and therefore, should not preclude the reader from generalizing and applying the discussions in this research to the Hawaiian culture in general, and the Hawaiian population at large.

New Meanings to Old Rituals

Ho'okipa is subject to the same anthropological scrutiny which has challenged the validity of all that is claimed as "traditional." Many anthropologists claim that tradition and culture are "invention" while native possessors assert that they are "authentic." Essentially, there is much to learn from both sides. Reflected in the arguments are basically cultural differences; the kind of disparity we might expect to find when the "truths" of one culture are transmitted, interpreted and evaluated via the "truths" of another
culture. The cerebral exercises which this debate inspires is an important lesson in perspectives: the proverbial glass of water that is either half-empty, or half-full, depending on one's viewpoint.

**The Invention of Tradition**

Much has been written on the subject of cultural invention over the last two decades. Roy Wagner's *The Invention of Culture* was the first in-depth probe of culture as a symbolic construct. Its main thesis asserts that societies manipulate symbols in order to create meaning and that the process is always a contemporary one. In Eric Hobsbawn and Terrence Ranger’s, *The Invention of Tradition*, the institutionalization of traditions in Europe, both political and social, are historically chronicled and established as recent inventions. The Royal Family, Welsh and Scottish scenarios and colonial India and South Africa are among the case studies. Curiously, these hallmark works did not create the same kind of turbulence in the Western world as similar arguments have in the Pacific. Perhaps this is due to the regional peculiarity of the players, their histories and respective agendas.

In the early 1980’s, Richard Handler and Jocelyn Linnekin raised issues regarding the “empirically and theoretically inadequate” definition of tradition. They too, concluded that its function involves a more symbolic and interpretive process than a fixed or bounded one. They discredited the dichotomy of modernity and tradition: “since all cultures change ceaselessly,
there can only be what is new..." 15 This significant twist away from the idea of cultures being timeless and eternal essences has "revolutionized" anthropological thought and approach. Judging by the plethora of scholarship on the subject to date, it seems reasonable to assume that the social scientific world has more than comfortably espoused this ideology as fundamental to the discipline of cultural anthropology.

One point of contention with this position, and there are many, concerns the use of the word "invention".16 Whether intended or not, it carries with it implications of falsity and inauthenticity.17 To indigenous people who have emotional and personal attachments to tradition and culture, this can be offensive and seems to echo the patronizing colonial ideologies and rhetoric that have historically marginalized and disenfranchised indigenous Pacific Islanders.

With the largely successful post-World War II trend towards global decolonization and the symbiotic rise in nationalism and independence movements, it was inevitable that cultural attitudes and ideas would somehow become attached to political platforms. As a result of societies constantly manipulating symbols and reinterpreting their past in terms of the present, most anthropologists have come to believe that all claims of authenticity and traditionalism are spurious and should be discredited, or even dismissed as politically-motivated strategies that are attached to agendas of nationalism. The allegation that certain traditional concepts have been
invented by indigenous activists for political reasons, and were never truly a part of traditional cultures, is a powerful statement, one that begs for some kind of proof, if not sensitivity. 18 A seemingly lone response from Hawaiian, Haunani-Kay Trask, calls such claims "racism" and "paternalism." 19 Trask has essentially been the sole warrior in the anthropological amphitheater, speaking out in support of Hawaiian sovereignty, and condemning "neocolonialism" and what she refers to as "institutional racism." Although "the invention of tradition" issue is posited as a "debate," the native opposition has been curiously silent on the issue, except for Trask, who took Roger Keesing to task in a rather succinct but exciting essay war. 20

The lack of native voices in anthropological discourse precludes any real debate from taking place. Where are all the native scholars? -- there is a bothersome "one-sided-ness" to this debate. That is not to say that no other native scholars exist, they most certainly do; but only that they have not spoken out as forthrightly as Trask has in the cultural invention debate. Important positions have been taken by Albert Wendt 21 on promoting indigenous historians, Epeli Hau'ofa 22 on pan-Pacific Island perspectives of unity and solidarity, and Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa 23 on the sacredness of land to indigenous peoples. It is upon the shoulders of these people and their indigenous colleagues that the upcoming generation of native islanders must rely as they struggle to define themselves and their culture in their own terms.

19
Global perceptions of Pacific peoples and cultures run the gamut from exotic to erotic. Issues of the “observer” versus the “observed” contribute to the way the world views indigenous cultures. Hence, questions of ethnographic authority arise. James Clifford, among others, has advocated for a post-modern departure from the “Mead and Malinowski” approaches. He explains that polyphony in ethnographic writing, by definition, creates within the discourse, a forum for multiple voices to speak their individual “truths”. Multiple voices are essential to fair and perhaps more “authentic” representations in anthropological literature. Don Handelman calls this the presence of the “native other.” It suggests that we should no longer buy into the “all knowing” posture of the researcher “presenting the facts.” In actuality, researchers for many years have taken their “foreign” tools into the “native” field with the assumption that they could authoritatively assess its true condition. This presumes that all other cultures are accurately measurable and can be made truly understandable through the foreign theories, philosophies and paradigms of the researcher’s culture. This presumption is, of course, problematic.

Conspicuously missing in the vast corpus of ethnographic literature is the presence of what the “observed” feels is important and meaningful. In other words, what attempts are made in capturing the native’s view of an issue? Researchers may sometimes disregard native views of the native’s culture because they believe them to be ignorant. After all, the researcher is
the one who has spent much time reading, writing, even teaching about the natives’ culture. In the researcher’s head, or at least at his fingertips, are decades, maybe centuries of scientific research. Because the native does not “know” what the researcher “knows,” the former must be deficient. This is intolerably patronizing whether or not it is intentional.

In these post-modern times, can this not be the “invention of anthropology?”—that is, the belief that somehow an outside researcher can really come to know, understand and speak authoritatively on a culture other than the one in which he was bred. Are not the researcher’s analyses really a “manipulation of symbols” which hang together nicely in the laboratory or dissertation but become meaningless in the community being studied? Isn’t this process constructed in the present in an attempt to understand the past? Once again, the answers to these questions are not as important as the issues raised in discussion and the ideas born from dialogue.

In reality, disagreements about culture are simply a reflection of different points of view which are based on different sets of “truths” and “ways of knowing.” Western society as a whole is dominated by Anglo-centric views of “what is” and to filter through, or break away from it can be frustrating, if not seemingly impossible.
Native Truths

Recently we have come to respect the “authority” of the native voice. In so doing, we have acknowledged and agreed that a special relationship exists between cultural information and the members of the culture from which said information comes. To really understand the depth of this agreement, we must give up our “all-knowing” and “finders keepers” mentalities. If we assume that most of us have great respect for man’s physical, social and cultural achievements, then we might also be moved to place as a priority, the “reassembly” of pieces of information that belong together, rather than the stereotypical “dissect and label” approach, which too often leads to inaccurate claims and misrepresentation. We must embark as “re-assemblers” rather than simply “collectors.” As we uncover cultural remnants in the “midden,” we must assist their “owners” in identifying both their old and new meanings. Lastly, daring to accept “other ways of knowing” is to make available a voluminous code book which can help to identify what “conventional” processes are unequipped to deal with (i.e. spirituality, magic, metaphysical phenomena etc.). In too many cases, we embark on our claim of cultural understanding even when we’ve knowingly bypassed integral parts of a culture simply because they deal with ancestral spirits, incantations, dreams, “superstitions” and so forth.

Man’s unique ability to commit thoughts to writing has had a tremendous effect on the shaping of social institutions and the manner in
which power is augmented, abated or transformed. Not only has the written medium evolved into numerous complex genres, it has also come to represent authority and truth. Somehow, because something is written down, we generally tend to accept it as being trustworthy. Hence, the great political potential of writing is limited only by one’s imagination. Because written falsehoods can be far more powerful than orally transmitted truths, the power base of a culture today is in its ability to document its memories.

The history of the Pacific is virtually a Western accounting of Pacific peoples and events. It is the outsider’s interpretation of what the insiders are doing at a particular point in time. Today we depend heavily on these early interpretations as we endeavor to learn more about the past. Again, this is problematic. In the process of recording, Europeans and Americans were influenced by the biases and idiosyncrasies of their own belief systems. They passed judgement on lifestyles they knew very little about and essentially forced the proverbial Pacific “square peg” in the Euro-American “round hole.” By far, with the exception of Kamakau, Ti, Malo and a few others, our sources about native life are by non-natives, even today. So, as natives strive to learn more about their own heritage, they must often build their value and belief systems upon Western paradigms of understanding: native truths in foreign terms.

In the doing of Pacific history, we are constantly challenged with the difficult task of analyzing Oceanic realities in Oceanic terms. Too often, we
unknowingly occidentalize our subjects because we continue to use instruments and processes that lack the capability of measuring beyond Western realities. Western historical discourse remembers well the "discovery, expansion and development" of the Pacific, but seems indifferent to the "invasion, confiscation and imperialism" that was experienced by Oceanic peoples. The decentralization of ethnographic authority, that is, allowing cultural insiders to tell their own stories in their own terms, is crucial in this regard. Again, poly-vocality surfaces as an important theme.

This is by no means an attempt to debase non-native accounts. In fact, the world and natives for that matter, would be largely unaware of the great and noteworthy achievements of native peoples if outsiders did not think to write about them. Non-native accounts form the critical mass of information which the world uses to understand native existence. The issue here, is really the lack of materials written about natives, by natives. This does not presume that natives will always write favorably of themselves, nor does it suggest that non-native historians categorically lack credibility in their interpretations of indigenous cultures. Rather, we must consider that the "messenger," in some cases, may be more important than the "message" itself. As we continue to probe and explore the impact of culture in Hawai'i and the Pacific, we need to accommodate, perhaps even consciously broaden the inventory of methodological approaches to serious research, by applying native processes
of interpretation which consider the range of cultural, spiritual and inspirational resources. Native truths, in native terms.

**Alternative Ways of Thinking**

The consideration of native perspectives has inspired alternative ways of approaching and understanding these issues. Perhaps the English words "tradition" and "culture" are insufficient to capture the full depth and breadth of native ideas. The term "connected-ness," that is, the sense of being part of a cultural "continuum" by which one is connected to the past and the future, may add a helpful new dimension to this discussion. As critics assert that natives have invented their culture, natives may feel that they are simply picking up where the ancestors left off on the continuum. The particular instruments and ideas which are brought to that continuum reflect the cultural contexts and experiences of the individual. However, they aren't nearly as important as one's obligation to maintain a sense of "connectedness" through the continuum. In other words, that things have changed over time do not mean that they are necessarily less "connected" or "traditional." This allows one to speak comfortably about ancestors who died centuries ago as if they were standing right before you. Likewise, it helps to inspire one's present actions to affect in a positive way, some future generation of descendants. To natives, how can this be "invention" when the
"umbilical" nature of the continuum originated with the creation of the world? These are really issues of perspective not authenticity.

To use Greg Dening's phraseology, "who is possessing whom" in the cultural invention debate? Is there truly a conflict, or have natives simply "possessed" elements of the colonizer's culture and made it their own? In 1820, missionization began in Hawai'i. In a few short years, the Bible was translated from Hebrew and Greek into Hawaiian, as Christian doctrine spread throughout the archipelago. When we peel away the layers of New England ethics and morals, and remove Euro-American ideologies and values, we must ask ourselves, "Did Hawaiians become Christian, or did Christianity become Hawaiian?" Perhaps Hawaiians "seized" Christianity and shaped it into an indigenous belief system. This scenario can be posed whenever Western interpretations condescend upon native interpretations. If I believe that my "cultural continuum" inherently validates my traditions, then there is much reason to claim "possession" of all kinds of things. For example, because Hawaiians use modern technology such as videos, computers and laser discs to perpetuate their traditions today, they should be able to claim those devices as "Hawaiian" having possessed and acculturated them.

Hence, ho'okipa boldly asserts its right to stand on its own as an important Hawaiian ideology in both native and anthropological forums.
Margaret Jolly shines a beam of hope on these issues in the following words of advice:

My argument is not that scholars should maintain silence, or I would not be speaking at all. But I do think we should be careful of what we say in what contexts. This does not imply a suspension of critical judgement, but avoiding a style of writing that presumes Western scholars have the truths and Pacific politicians are perpetrating illusions of self-delusions. I doubt that scholars any more than Pacific peoples can tell 'real pasts'......Rather than presenting our account as real 'pasts,' Western scholars might look more carefully and comparatively at the encoding of past-present relations in the variety of symbolic constitutions of traditions. Then our questions might cease to be those of persistence versus invention, or whether tradition is genuine or spurious.27

In order to study and better understand the hospitality process, five elements have been identified and are explained in detail in Chapter III. Briefly, they are: heahea (call of welcome), mea ‘ai (food), kuleana (purpose of visitation), le‘ale‘a (fun and entertainment) and makana (gifts). Together, they reveal the human processes at work in Hawaiian society -- codes that made Hawaiian life meaningful. To assume that any of the elements can truly stand alone is a mistake. It is imperative that each be seen as an interactive element in the chemistry of ho’okipa. We must be careful to reassemble them before we embark with our claim of knowing, understanding and most certainly, practicing.
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CHAPTER II
BOUNDARY CROSSING: AN OCEANIC LEGACY

The Peopling of the Pacific

Under the single rubric of *ho'okipa* is a host of concepts, conditions, processes and agreements that basically relate to the interaction of people. Whether on the tiny island of Eloaua which lies about 150 kilometers northwest of New Ireland in the Bismarck Archipelago, or on quaint Lānaʻi, the third smallest island in the inhabited Hawaiian island chain, people were able to survive because they wisely monitored the exploitation of their islands’ limited resources and they developed effective social codes of behavior -- agreements about consumption, exchange, “boundary crossing” and reciprocation.

This chapter chronicles the peopling of Oceania, from man’s initial departure off the Southeast Asian coast, and on through the Melanesian exchange networks of the Lapita Cultural Complex. Brief discussion of the “explosion” of exploratory voyages into the remote regions of Eastern Polynesia will conclude northward in Hawai‘i, the main setting for the discussions of this thesis. As this cultural-historical “time travel” through the Pacific progresses, it is important to keep in mind the sense of “connectedness” that existed over millennia -- the idea that over time and space, certain practical and ideological “traditions” have been inherited and bequeathed.
over the course of hundreds of successful landfalls. There are a number of reasons to suggest that the Hawaiian concepts of *ho'okipa* were essentially part of an ancient legacy of "exchange" and "boundary crossing" protocol that enabled Pacific peoples to not only survive within their dynamic and boundless "sea of islands," but flourish. 

Let us begin our hunt for oceanic connections by using the backdrop of Pacific archaeology to reconstruct prehistorical scenarios and to gain a scientific perspective of Pacific peoples and systems. To add fullness to our understanding, traditional stories and concepts will be reviewed and discussed. An important objective of this chapter is to understand that Hawaiian culture did not simply appear out of nowhere; the ideas and concepts which shaped it were inherited through a legacy of landfalls and settlement experiences. Hawaiians must learn to re-connect themselves to the rest of the Pacific by making links in a variety of ways and forms. The fairly substantial presentation on early Pacific developments and the Lapita Cultural Complex are not intended to imply a bias towards archaeology and anthropology as the "bearers of truth." Rather, in the opinion of the writer, these areas are probably the least familiar among Hawaiian readers and hence, are presented in this chapter for more thoughtful consideration.
Stepping Stones to the East

Over 40,000 years ago, man was moved by a compulsion to explore his Pacific surroundings -- he was inspired to travel beyond the comfortable continental edges of his Southeast Asian home to explore new territory overseas. The movement of these hunters and gatherers marked the first effort of human expansion beyond the continental mass made up of Africa, Europe and Asia.\(^2\) Though crude, the vessels they constructed proved sturdy enough to transport them through the chain of Indonesian islands and eventually to the then-connected, yet uninhabited lands we call Australia and New Guinea today. Because much more of the Earth’s water was frozen at the polar caps at that time, significantly lower water levels left large land masses exposed. The inter-visibility of the numerous island environs further facilitated efforts of colonization and the pattern of exploration and settlement continued.\(^3\)

Over the next several dozen millennia, the Bismarcks, Solomons, Vanuatu and the entire region we call Melanesia today, was first settled. Recently, evidence has been published which seems to confirm human settlement in the Solomon Islands by 28,000 B.P.\(^4\) That the first colonization efforts in this region began in the Pleistocene period reveals the great antiquity of initial Melanesian occupation. As eastward movement continued beyond the southern Solomons, sea gaps between land masses exceeded 300 kilometers in distance making landfalls far more challenging.\(^5\)
The current risen sea levels have separated islands which were formerly connected or more easily accessible during glacial periods. Farther distances required greater skills and better quality vessels. Although there is still much to learn about early Melanesian culture and occupation, we are now certain that initial settlement occurred far earlier than previously thought.

For decades, the whence of the Polynesians was one of the great Pacific mysteries. A number of theories were developed by a host of creative minds, all attempting to prove how Polynesians ended up where they were upon European arrival in the eighteenth century. Some believed that the immediate ancestors of the Polynesians were either Micronesian, Indonesian, or perhaps Filipino. 6 Others believed them to be the descendants of the lost tribes of Israel. 7 Sir Peter Buck’s “Vikings of the Sunrise” theory was successful in its leading researchers to consider South East Asia as a place of origin. 8 But whether or not it was by way of Micronesian or Melanesia remained a serious debate. Theories implying origins in Melanesia were carefully “avoided” which reflected the prejudices and stereotypes of those times. Defiantly, South America was thought to be the homeland by Thor Heyerdahl and others who were intrigued by the anomalistic introduction of the sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) and what seemed to be cultural and linguistic connections. 9 Fairly recently, stimulating discoveries in Micronesia have prompted more research efforts and the development of new theories.
regarding the peopling of that region are ongoing. 10 Those results may shed more light on Polynesian theories of origin in the years to come.

Man's gradual movements from west to east placed him in more remote oceanic environments which required adjustment, adaptation and innovation. Research strongly supports that Polynesian culture did not enter intact from some distant homeland but rather, developed its distinct uniqueness here in Polynesia. 11 Kirch succinctly explains:

As one moves from the island arcs of Melanesia into the remote tracts of the Pacific, the islands become, not only more isolated, but geologically simpler, and frequently biotically depauperate. These constraints led to the adaptive development of new cognitive and behavioral patterns. Thus the contribution of a prehistoric perspective has been to show that those cultural patterns characteristic of Polynesia were not carried intact along migration routes, but developed in situ. The Polynesians became Polynesians in Oceania, over the course of several thousands of years of adaptive change. 12

For decades, there were more questions than answers regarding the origins of Pacific peoples. It wasn't until a series of discoveries uncovered ceramic potsherds that we have come generally to agree and to feel confident about the probable origins of the Polynesians.

**The Lapita "Aquatic Highway"**

Assemblages uncovered at various sites throughout the vast region from the Bismarck archipelago to Samoa, strongly indicate that a unique pottery-making culture thrived from 1600 to 500 B.C. It is important to note
early on that pottery is by no means the only indicator of the existence of this
culture -- indeed there are many other indicators, some of which are far more
significant. Some researchers believe that the Lapita Cultural Complex was
simply the ceramic part of a more extensive cultural sequence. Simply,
pottery gives us a window into the development of the culture and helps us
to track and identify unique attributes which may help solve some of the
Lapita mystery.

The rise and fall of this widespread civilization can be traced clearly
and specifically within a particular era giving it the typical attributes of a
“cultural horizon,” in American archaeological terms. Characteristic motifs
which are found throughout the region seem to support a cultural continuity
and there is reason to believe that the spread of Lapita culture was fairly rapid.
Over time, the eastern part of the region, specifically Fiji, Tonga and Samoa,
became isolated from the western region (essentially Melanesia), causing
localized “traditions” from each to emerge. The presence of both “horizon”
and “traditional” attributes have led to the use of the term “cultural complex”
in reference to the civilization as a whole.

Over the years, a number of theories have been developed to explain
Lapita origins. The Lapita people were an Austronesian-speaking
community, unlike those who had settled the area dozens of millennia
earlier. Some believe that they had moved in, and moved on through
Melanesia quite rapidly according to the “fast train” theory. Others claim
there is evidence to suggest that Lapita settlements were a lot more fixed and permanent and that they lived in Melanesia for a very long time. In any event, we can assume there was co-existence between the Austronesian Lapita latecomers and the initial non-Austronesian settlers. While it is probable that both groups intermarried and assimilated in certain areas during certain periods under particular circumstances, evidence strongly suggests that on the whole, both tended to maintain their cultural uniqueness.

The most well known feature of the Lapita Cultural Complex is its pottery. Kirch describes them as "generally well-fired, frequently calcareous-sand tempered, paddle-and-anvil finished, earthenware vessels (including shouldered pots, jars, bowls, flat-bottomed dishes, and plates)." The characteristic dentate-stamped designs consisting of a fairly limited range of design elements have been used to create some 150 motifs. There are some who believe that the traditional bark cloth designs of Fiji, Tonga and Samoa today are related to ancient Lapita designs. Generations of Oceanic peoples have been inspired by the movements of the ocean, the stellar map of the Pacific firmament and themes of fertility and growth. Again, a sense of connection spans across time. A significant number of these designs are found throughout the region testifying to the continuity of the Lapita culture and a plausible connection to a tradition of stylized Polynesian expressions.

Their settlements appear to be largely coastal. Lapita communities depended heavily on marine resources which is reflected in the significant
amount of fish bones and bones of larger sea animals such as shark, turtle and
dugong found at most settlement sites. Vulnerable seabirds and flightless
birds that are “naive” from the previous lack of predators were probably more
abundant prior to Lapita colonization, but were heavily exploited by their
non-Austronesian predecessors. However, significant amounts of chicken
and pig bones have been discovered. This strongly supports the symbiotic
existence of horticulture. Sub-standard fruits and tubers were fed to pigs,
which in turn, produced high yields of high-protein meat. Hence, the
presence of large amounts of pig bones is evidence of high horticultural
activity. Also, the appearance of food scrapers and peelers, and what may be
fermentation pits further support an agrarian lifestyle. That Lapita society
had access to rich marine resources, high yields of animal protein and
extensive harvests from crops strongly suggests that their communities were
large and organized. This has been confirmed by the archaeological evidence
of fairly large settlement sites.

Another characteristic feature of the Lapita cultural complex is the
importation of goods between Lapita sites; distances that would require open­
sea voyaging capabilities. Although it is known that pottery was transported
as evidenced by the presence of some exotic sherds, it is believed that pottery
was largely locally manufactured. Rather, among the most frequent items of
importation were obsidian, stone-adze, chert for flake tools and a range of
shell artifacts. That obsidian, in particular, is traceable, such that its exact
source can be determined, is the strongest proof that the Lapita people possessed effective voyaging skills and practices. Further, that the Lapita seafarers could travel from point A to B and return to point A, traversing distances as far as 450-480 kilometers (i.e. Santa Cruz to Vanuatu, or Vanuatu to New Caledonia) sets them apart from their non-Austronesian predecessors in terms of cultural development, technological skills and social organization which are all related to capability of voyaging long distances. Presumably, these journeys were made between numerous established Lapita centers, each perhaps, offering locally manufactured goods for exchange. There is physical proof that items were imported throughout the Lapita cultural complex through a voyaging network which also potentially served as an effective mechanism for the sharing of knowledge, language and beliefs. Hence, for centuries, the entire complex may have practiced a culture that shared very key homogenous qualities as a result of frequent contact and interchange.

Over time, an Eastern Lapita cultural complex developed in the Fiji-Tonga-Samoa region. The distance between Fiji and Vanuatu is approximately 850 kilometers, almost twice as far as any other voyage by Oceanic man up to that point. As a result, the initial Lapita settlers who began colonizing the uninhabited islands in the east lost contact with the island groups to the west, and consequently an eastern tradition developed in isolation. Both linguistic and archaeological evidence reveals the ancestral relationship between the Eastern Lapita cultural complex and what is referred to as
Ancestral Polynesian Society. 24 It was there in that Eastern Triangle that certain evolutionary changes took on distinguishing characteristics forming the ancestral base for the development of Polynesian culture. To echo Emory’s theory posed some thirty-five years ago, Polynesians indeed, developed in Polynesia. 25

Our understanding of Polynesian culture is enriched and made more complete when we consider the prehistorical conditions under which its development occurred. Although Polynesian cultural development had an indigenous evolution, that process included the perpetuation of certain antediluvian mainstream-mainstay traditions which have evolved into what we have today. Indeed, as we critically review the characteristic aspects of Polynesian cultures, we come to the realization that their skills, practices, language and perspectives of life and truth were surely born from the same spirit, the same mettle, that allowed their Lapita ancestors to flourish millennia before them. As Roger Green put it:

Moreover, it was the Lapita ancestors who developed many of the preadaptations in voyaging and navigation, who established viable populations with their plants and animals on the less well endowed islands of Melanesia, and who pursued what Buck (1938) called a Viking-like quest to continue exploration ever into the sunrise that allowed their Polynesian descendants to fill the remaining empty zone of the Pacific in something like a thousand years. 26
The Birth of Polynesians

Because contact with the expansive chain of Melanesian islands to the west ceased, certain peculiarities began to develop in Fiji. One cultural strain seemed to maintain a “Melanesian-ness” while the other expanded farther east creating a cultural network in Tonga and Samoa. Hence, Fiji is seen as a gateway to Polynesia because it represents the transition from the East Lapita Cultural Complex to the Ancestral Polynesian Culture. It is within this micro-triangle that Polynesian culture was born.

These early settlers continued to produce pottery. The large continental islands of Fiji are old and geologically complex; chert and obsidian sources are located within its boundaries. However, the farther we move east into the remote Pacific regions and past the andesite line, the types of available resources change. The andesite border and areas nearby have high levels of volcanic activity which mark the point of contact between the Fiji plate and the Pacific plate. Ceramic, adze and other cultural changes are directly related to this geological factor.

From approximately 1500 B.C. to the middle of the first millennia A.D., a distinct Ancestral Polynesian Culture emerged. The presence of exotic materials such as pottery, adzes, chert and obsidian in unnatural locations has been attributed to import networks which appeared to be in full operation during the Early Eastern Lapita age, roughly between 1500 B.C. and 1000 B.C. However, between 1000 and 500 B.C., evidence of imported materials
declined, suggesting that locales within the network became self-sufficient and no longer dependent on overseas communities for goods. If this is so, then inter-island voyaging between these sites would have eventually diminished, thereby encouraging local cultural developments. Tonga and Samoa maintained a certain cultural continuity distinct from Fiji which laid the archaic foundation of Western Polynesia. Over time, while still maintaining periodic contact and mutually perpetuating a range of ancestral characteristics, Samoa began to take on certain cultural distinctions from Tonga. While it is hard to fix an exact date on processes that develop over time, archaeologists have identified discernibly divergent Polynesian characteristics by around 500 B.C. In terms of pottery, the Lapitoid Series shows a devolution in pottery shapes and designs indicating that ceramic forms became more simple with eastward movement. Crude and often undecorated, the devolved Polynesian Plain Ware represents the latter end of the lapitoid series. Fairly early in the first millennia A.D., pottery making disappeared altogether. The availability of ceramic clay throughout the Western Polynesian region, as well as in the yet undiscovered eastern groups, illustrates that the abandonment of the craft may have been more the result of a change in cooking or food storage practices rather than the often alleged "lack of clay resources."  

Ancestral Polynesians had developed a dynamic culture which was firmly built on the trials and errors of their Lapita forbears. Perhaps the
names of prominent chiefs and navigators from the Lapita era continued to resound in the praise songs of Ancestral Polynesians centuries later. Maybe the obscure names in Samoan or Tongan oral traditions are really remnants of Melanesian personages. Ideas continued to be passed on from generation to generation; with each landfall came more refinement in skills and knowledge. Within the 500 year period before the Christian era, perhaps at a time when Samoa and Tonga (and possibly even Fiji) might have still been homogenous culturally, Polynesian seafarers penetrated the invisible barrier to the east, thereby opening significant new chapters in the annals of Pacific exploration and human achievement.

**The Eastern Frontier**

It is most uncertain as to what caused this movement from Western Polynesia into the remote east. However, to accomplish such a feat, those early Polynesians must have been highly skilled at long distance sailing. The navigational knowledge which was developed over millennia and which facilitated the movement of the Austronesian-speaking ancestors from the Asian continent, through the island arcs of Melanesian and on to Western Polynesia had acquired over time, the potential to carry them even farther east. Not only had they the ability to transport themselves great distances but also were able to “transport their landscapes.” 34 That is, they brought with them the range of plants and animals needed for survival in their new home,
as well as the technology to shape their new environs in ways that enabled them to survive and flourish.

Samoa and its tiny southern neighbors who share lineage from Nuclear Polynesian speaking branches (Niutotoputapu, Niuafo'ou, Futuna, Uvea, etc.) are all possible Western Polynesian departure sites. The earliest East Polynesian settlements have been found at the Hane and Ha'atuatua sites in the Northern Group, which age somewhere between 150 A.D. and about 300 A.D. Polynesian Plain Ware ceramics were uncovered at both sites. Some of the remnants may have been imported from the west thereby further supporting the idea of initial Marquesan settlement in Eastern Polynesia. Kenneth Emory and Yoshi Sinoto maintain that the Marquesas functioned as a primary dispersal point from where the Societies, Easter Island, New Zealand and Hawaii were settled. However, in recent years, problems with this "orthodox scenario" have been discussed and debated and we have been challenged to consider new ways of thinking about Eastern Polynesian settlement.

There is much to wonder about when pondering why Western Polynesian voyagers would have settled the Marquesas, some 3,500 kilometers to the east, before settling other islands in the Societies which are much closer. To date, the assemblages of the early Marquesan sites and those in Western Polynesia of the same era are not similar enough to justify a direct link. Curiously, that the Marquesas dates are the oldest so far, seem to
justify to some that it was the point of initial contact. Others believe that there is simply an inadequate sample of excavations from which to draw sound conclusions. 40 Another problem is geomorphism. Once-populated coastal areas in the Societies, where presumably older sites may be located, are now submerged. Hence, we may no longer have access to the evidence of direct links with Western Polynesia. 41

As we continue efforts in the reconstruction of Proto-East-Polynesian society, there is more and more reason to believe that a homogenous Eastern Polynesian culture spanned the Marquesas, Societies, some of the Tuamotu and possibly the Cooks: the idea of a “regional homeland.” 42 The basic culture that was taken to the peripheral points of the Polynesian triangle seems to have evolved within this central “homeland” at which point it became distinct from Western Polynesian culture. The rapid colonization of Eastern Polynesia has often been described as the result of “an explosion of voyages”. An Ancestral Eastern Polynesian culture dispersed throughout Eastern Polynesia where it was reshaped by the peculiarities and characteristics of a variety of landscapes -- atolls, high islands, and in the case of New Zealand, even glaciers.

As previously mentioned, archaeologists believe that the initial colonizing voyages to Hawai‘i were made from the Marquesas. While dates differ among scholars, 300 A.D. or thereabouts is probably an acceptable arrival date to most, based on carbon 14 dating. Linguists have categorized
Hawaiian as belonging to the Proto-Marquesic group which further indicates a direct relationship. However, there is also reason to believe that there was settlement from the Society Islands, probably from the second millennium. Significant cultural links with Tahitian culture have been identified through archaeology, language and lore. Hence, there were probably multiple voyages from both the Marquesas and the Societies. Clearly, archaeological evidence reveals that early colonizers came prepared to colonize, 43 As demonstrated through the successful landfalls of the Hōkūle‘a and as recalled in the orally-preserved traditions of Hawai‘i and other Pacific cultures, Polynesians possessed the wherewithal to conduct purposeful two-way voyages which they did with extraordinary skill and prowess.

**The Art of Boundary Crossing in Polynesia**

So far, the movements of Pacific peoples from the western regions of Melanesia to the remote regions of Eastern Polynesia have been chronicled in very straightforward terms. These migrations had motives and purposes that were tied to human emotions and aspirations. As boundaries were crossed, either by canoe or on foot, certain sensitivities regarding status, power and respect came into play. Hospitality, that is, the manner in which one is made to feel welcome, became an important feature of boundary crossing protocol. Whether between islands or valleys, the protocol of welcome was crucial, and
each Polynesian culture developed its own unique ceremonies and rituals to meet these needs.

When traveling in Samoa, one was always careful to know his connections, both politically and genealogically. This information was often a life-saving factor in boundary crossing. Formal visitations involved long and complex ceremonies which were directed through the use of a chiefly dialect and which featured the traditional drinking of kava (*Piper methysticum*). One source explains that the partaking of kava was a means of communing with the gods. Chiefs would situate themselves in a circle according to their rank. The host and his servants would help to prepare the kava with rituals and prayers. When a chiefly dignitary arrived, it was important to greet him properly by offering him the seat of honor and by passing him the kava cup in a particular manner. To pass it incorrectly could be a grave insult. Honorific speeches, songs and the offering of fine mats, cloth and pigs were all important parts of formal Samoan hospitality. 44

In Ra’iatea, high ranking voyagers were expected to sail to the district of Opoa to pay a visit to Taputapuatea *marae*, a temple of high worship. The source of all the major chiefly lines throughout the Society Islands, Taputapuatea was considered to be among the most sacred temples in all of Polynesia. Homage must be paid to the blood-thirsty god, ‘Oro, before carrying on with one’s business. As the canoes lined up outside the reef, drums were sounded and conch shells blew to herald the arrival of the chiefly
newcomers. Traditions say that dolphins would surface near the vessel to escort the visitors through Teavamo’a pass and into the lagoon proper. As travelers approached the boundaries of Ra’iatea, they were careful to observe its tapu. Ra’iatea is believed to be one of the main legendary homelands of the Polynesian people: Havaiki. 45

The steep mountain walls and the sheer sea cliffs of Nukuhiva created great barriers between neighboring villages. Communities were largely inaccessible to each other and growing hostilities often led to war. Rather than risk bloodshed, the chiefs, or hakaiki, would sometimes wage wars of "hospitality" called ko’ika. Invited groups would "compete" against their hosts in feasting, gift-giving and in entertainment. Some traditions say that the guests were careful never to outdo the hosts, for this would be most embarrassing and war might result. Marquesans developed creative ways to deal with the complex boundary politics of their society.46

Traditional accounts of Maori visitation protocol are embodied in the powhiri, the ceremony of welcome. A female hostess chants out to the visitors who stand outside the marae (ancestral gathering place). A female visitor responds with a chant as the guests move closer to the compound. In formal situations, the hosts send a wero, who is a warrior armed with a taiaha, (ceremonial bladed shaft). The warrior dances defiantly toward the visiting group and lays down a leaf. If the leaf is picked up by the visitors, it is an indication of peace. After the guests enter the marae, there is a lengthy
exchange of oratory, songs and a ritual grieving for the dead. Upon completion of this litany of events, all greet each other with a hongi (traditional kiss) and proceed to the feasting area. Maori greeting traditions maintain a variety of elements from aggressive warfare to intellectual oratory.47

The unique characteristics of a place and its people are reflected in the style of hospitality exchanged between hosts and visitors. To better understand what inspired Hawaiians in the creation of their own unique style of ho‘okipa, let us take a closer look at Hawai‘i’s natural evolution and the socio-political development of its people.

The Hawaiian Civilization

When we gaze out upon the urban jungle of Honolulu today, it is difficult to imagine what it must have looked like without the concrete freeways and highrises. Only seven or eight generations ago, bustling kauhale (multi-unit living compound), geometrically-perfect terraces of kalo (taro) and a variety of stone structures ranging from bold heiau (temples) sites to prominent boundary markers, would have been the typical backdrop. In pre-Western times, indigenous technology had rapidly progressed and society became highly stratified which led to the development of a very complex civilization. However, notwithstanding the high level of ingenuity and the monumental achievements of early Hawaiians, it is still important to
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understand that the vibrant Hawai‘i which greeted Capt. Cook some two hundred years ago was drastically different from that which greeted the first canoe load of Polynesian founders some two-thousand years ago. Truly, those initial settlers were forced to adapt to a new environment, which, though largely similar to their southern homeland, presented its own unique set of challenges. Reflected in the Kumulipo, a traditional Hawaiian cosmological genealogy, is the indigenous understanding that much indeed was going on here in these islands before man arrived on the scene. Nature had been busy at work for eons, shaping, molding and creating a breathtaking gallery of masterpieces. 48

**Nature’s Creative Genius**

After millions of years of vulcanism which started with Kure and extended southeastward about 1,600 miles a dynamic chain of island masses became home to a fairly limited number of pioneer plant, insect and bird species which were “adept at long-distance dispersal.” 49 Natural colonization took millions of years to occur, and chance played a large part in what actually arrived and became established. The Hawaiian chain is separated from other land masses by thousands of miles of ocean making it among the most isolated places on earth. 50

Hawai‘i’s most attractive feature to ecologists and biologists is its high level of endemism. Most of the hardy pioneers which survived the natural
dispersal process probably came from Asiatic and Indonesian homelands. Others came from the American coast. Adaptive radiation and speciation occurred rapidly resulting in the evolution of thousands of new species and subspecies found nowhere else on earth. Some 275 immigrant plant ancestors arriving once every 50-70,000 years evolved into approximately 2,676 taxonomic groups, almost all of which are endemic. A single ancestor of the Hawaiian honey creeper (Drepanididae), a variety of finch, evolved into nearly forty different species and subspecies. Some 22-24 colonizations of nine families created more than 1,000 species of endemic land snails. Perhaps the most dramatic case of speciation is in the case of the drosophila fly: over 500 species have evolved from a common ancestor. Due to the range of dispersal barriers, the Hawaiian biota is largely disharmonic: Hawai‘i was not settled by the full range of taxa common on continental environments. In fact, only one terrestrial mammal existed prior to human contact; a variety of hoary bat (Lasiurus cinereus semotus).

The lowland areas which extended from the shore to the slopes of the mountains, consisted of open parkland terrain. This zone, filled with generally low growing vegetation, served as a home for a variety of land snails and insects, and a number of flightless geese, rails, a flightless ibis, the nēnē (Nesochen sandwicensis) and other fauna. The upper dry forest zone was dominantly koa forest (Acacia koa). Beneath its canopy a host of other species established themselves. Marked by the abundance of ʻōhiʻa
(Metrisoderos polymorpha), the wet forest zone acted as a kind of sponge which held the moisture delivered by wind and rain. In extremely wet areas, bogs developed which sustained their own unique inventory of species. Lastly, Hawai‘i’s alpine regions, which extend from the wet forest zones to the summits of the highest mountains were home to some of the most interesting examples of adaptive shift in island speciation. Contrary to common perceptions, much indeed was going on in the Hawaiian chain prior to human settlement. Largely free from the threat of serious predators, a unique set of life forms flourished in the fragile eco-systems which had developed over eons.

Initial Hawaiian Landfall and Settlement Reconstructed

The chapters which man has added to the natural history of Hawai‘i are of relatively recent composition; a mere two thousand years or so of activity. However, in terms of impact, they are probably the most crucial chapters of all. The colonizing skills which facilitated Pacific settlement were really a legacy from generations of successful voyaging. While the following descriptions refer specifically to Hawai‘i, they also reflect some of the same kinds of experiences encountered by the Lapita ancestors during their early exploratory treks across the southwest Pacific.

After sighting certain sea birds, the confirming and most outstanding feature visible from approaching canoes, would have been the lofty cloud-
laden peaks of the main islands. Snow-capped Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa must have been awesome sights to those early travelers. These would have been seen miles off, especially in good weather. Another prominent feature would have been the presence of thousands of seabirds lining the coastal regions. The absence of significant predators made the Hawaiian chain a haven for all types of avifauna. 57

It is possible that the very first Polynesians arrived on one or two vessels and numbered between twenty and forty individuals.58 They could not possibly have brought with them the range of taxa that we acknowledge as being Polynesian introductions today -- many succeeding and return voyages were necessary. At the point of initial colonization, settlement was most often coastal and concentrated in a few areas where water was accessible. As the population increased either through the arrival of more settlers, or through increased reproduction, the more pressure and demand was placed on the food sources of the settled region.

Islands which have never experienced human contact tend to have a high proportion of naive animals, that is, animals which have no experience in dealing with predators. Hence, large populations of birds with ground-nesting habits or limited flight ability were hunted intensely by settlers. The lack of food plants in this new environment led them to exploit seabirds, especially flightless ones, which were abundant and easily-caught. Birds were an excellent food source and were heavily hunted especially in the initial
years of settlement before agricultural efforts were substantial. The fairly recent discovery of the remains of previously unknown birds suggests that some species may have been hunted to the point of extinction. There is also some debate over the postulation that some forty endemic species of birds became extinct after the Polynesians arrived. Rapid exploitation may have led to faunal depletions, extirpation and then, overall extinction. Archaeologists sometimes identify sites of early or initial settlement by looking for a disproportionately high exploitation of bird bones or remnants of marine fauna. Founding populations would have depended heavily on these available resources and would not have had a mix of cultivated plant foods in their diet at the onset.

Faunal depletions were not only the result of subsistence requirements but also of habitat alterations. When forests were cleared, land snails, birds and other participants in the eco-system were affected. They were challenged to either find an ecological niche where they could meet the demands of survival, or change their own survival requirements. The disappearance of certain species often caused other species which depended on them either as food or as contributors to the ecosystem, to also die off.

The reef and deep sea fauna would have been quite familiar to the settlers and surely provided them a rich and bountiful source of protein and other nutrients. Polynesian settlers possessed adequate skills and technology to exploit these resources, but over time, developed even more effective
methods of fishing which were more conducive to the range of new environments and conditions. Fishhooks and other fishing paraphernalia underwent a number of progressive changes which archaeologists have been able to read as chronological and developmental markers. The abundance of marine resources was tremendous and more than sufficient in those early years.

Upon arrival, the search for a freshwater source would have been the highest priority. For a number of generations, early settlers established themselves in coastal areas which were near streams and springs. Windward valleys were characteristically wetter and more fertile, and would have been among the earliest settlements. Freshwater sources were not only for drinking, but for agriculture as well. According to Kirch, "Rainfall, stream flow and soil regimes...presented a varied landscape to which the colonizing Polynesians...had to adapt their agricultural techniques". However, the height of agricultural production, especially extensive and complex irrigation, probably did not occur until the fourteenth or fifteenth century.

As coastal food sources began to wane, range expansion occurred. Because not all parts of an island were inhabited upon arrival, people were able to move to unsettled areas when necessary. As they moved away from the initial points of settlement, the pressure on the original food sources reduced, which in some cases, allowed for recovery. At that point, agricultural practices increased which created a diversified subsistence for the
population. The populations that explored the inland areas presumably found new resources to exploit. Over time, an overall balance was established between what the environment was able to provide, what man produced and consumed, and population growth.

The lowland areas were densely covered with flora from the mountains to the sea, and were no doubt a vital habitat to a host of arthropods, non-marine mollusks and birds. The increase of human population made it necessary to clear the lowland zones for settlement. These zones were deforested through a process of burning. Clearing would have been minimal in the early years of settlement, but would eventually extend to the inhabitable areas of all the islands. This increase in land clearing over the course of centuries was relative to the growing intensity of agricultural efforts which were employed to accommodate more people, and the demands of a more stratified society. 63

Initial Polynesian settlers would have noticed only a few familiar plants: the pōhuehue, naupaka and hau, among them. As native "biologists" in their own right, they would have quickly began experimenting with, and naming the many newly-encountered species. Adding to this diverse inventory, Polynesians brought with them a range of biota which would help them to survive and establish themselves in their new home. As colonizers introduced more plants from their southern homelands, the development of cultivation areas became necessary. 64 As we attempt to reconstruct the
processes involved in settlement, we sometimes imagine that all the flora and fauna attributed to Polynesians were brought on every canoe. In reality, the range of introduced biota was transported over generations of landfalls and return voyages. Among the most significant food plants were the taro, sweet potato, banana, breadfruit and coconut. Polynesian varieties of pigs, dogs and chickens also greatly enhanced their sources of food. The proliferation of these plants and animals successfully sustained a large human population. Hence, the transition from a natural ecosystem to one that was severely manipulated by humans began at the point of initial contact by Polynesians, not Westerners, as is often thought.

**Agriculture and Aquaculture**

There were basically two types of agriculture in pre-Western times: wetland and dryland cultivation. The former refers exclusively to the growing of taro (*Colocasia esculenta*), a pan-Polynesian staple crop. The latter primarily involves the growing of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*), a secondary staple. After about a millennia and a half, virtually all lowland areas with rainfall upward of 500 mm were used for agriculture. These areas were called *kula*, and generally referred to the valley floors and the flat and fertile areas between the mountains and the sea. The clearing of these areas for planting, was of course, relative to the size of the population and the development of the unique socio-political characteristics of the time period.
Taro was grown in man-made ponds called lo‘i kalo, or lo‘i. Originally, they were conveniently situated near streams and yielded sufficient amounts for the fairly small size of the early population. As the population increased, higher yields were necessary and more area needed to be cleared for the construction of larger lo‘i. Consistent amounts of fresh cold water were diverted from streams and fed into taro patches through a very complex system of irrigation ditches called ‘auwai. In most cases, after filling many lo‘i, the water flowed back into the same water course at some point down stream. 67 In addition to facilitating significant yields, many lo‘i served ecosystems of their own. Goby, or ‘o’opu, among other fish, were sometimes raised in lo‘i. The nutrients from the some lo‘i flowed into fishponds which sustained life for other organisms as well. Some three hundred or so varieties of taro were known in pre-Western times. The development of this monumental feat of engineering altered, not only the political and religious structure of society, but also the once-pristine condition of the land. 68 Within five or six hundred years of initial contact, the Hawaiian environment had changed significantly at the hands of early settlers.

While the taro is considered to be the primary staple, the sweet potato or ‘uala, was also intensely cultivated and was by no means, less important.
In fact, it could be seen as more favorable in that it had a higher tolerance to adverse conditions, it matured in three to six months and it was far less labor intensive to maintain. Although it is South American in origin, the conditions by which it was transported into Polynesia are still uncertain. Some believe that natives from the Americas arrived in the Marquesas bearing the tuber in their inventory. Others feel that a stronger likelihood exists where Marquesan inhabitants could have continued their exploration towards the “sunrise” until they reached continental shores. Perhaps *kumara* (Central Polynesian term for sweet potato) was brought back with them on their return voyage. This latter theory has met with more support than the former, among Pacific scholars. 69

In *taro* cultivation, lowland forest areas were massively cleared through burning to prepare for the construction of sweet potato fields. The soil was dug up thoroughly and stones were removed. New patches were often constructed near the end of the rainy season to allow the soil to get just enough moisture. *ʻUala* cuttings from old vines and tubers were then replanted in the moist patch. Shifting cultivation was intensely practiced and each region engaged in cultivation methods and styles appropriate to its own particular terrain and conditions.

*ʻUala* favors a drier climate and was grown extensively in leeward areas. On Hawai‘i Island, remnants of these fields indicate that they were of tremendous size and capable of producing incredible yields. In valleys and
mountainous areas, hillsides were used for 'uala cultivation leaving the flat well-watered areas for taro. Over-planting, however, loosened the soil causing landslides and the erosion of hillsides and slopes, which were often disastrous. 70

Large 'uala plantations were irrigated like taro, but the water requirements were far less. 'Auwai were used to irrigate the fields in an intermittent fashion as needed. In valleys, dryland taro patches were sometimes used for 'uala during droughts. When the rains returned, they were replaced again with taro.71 While dryland taro and other crops such as yams and sugarcane were also successfully harvested through dryland cultivation, 'uala was by far the leading crop.

Loko i'a

Unique, however, among all the Pacific island cultures is the Hawaiian development of loko i'a, or fishponds. Kamakau wrote that "...Fishponds were things that beautified the land, and a land with many fishponds was called, 'fat'."72 Hawaiians were able to harvest significant amounts of fish using this method and nowhere in any of their southern homelands had such a high level of aquaculture technology been practiced. The use of sluice gates and the overall construction and design were of local development. Not only were Hawaiians able to harvest fish but create artificial ecosystems for fish husbandry. 73 Kikuchi says that most of the 449 fishponds built before
1830 were of prehistoric construction and that about 41% of them were located on O‘ahu. 74

Archaeological findings strongly suggest that an important relationship existed among the simultaneous development of fishpond, horticulture and stratification. That a chief could have at his convenience, as much ‘awa (milkfish, Chanos chanos) or ‘ama‘ama (mullet, Mugil cephalis) as he wanted, and could furnish enough fish for his entire retinue, made fishponds a political symbol of power, control and wealth. 75 Many scholars believe that the function of fishponds were part of the overall effort towards the intensification of production, that is, the producing of high yields as demanded by the chiefs, for political and economic gain.

The early settlers adapted well to the topographical and climatic conditions of their new home over time. The high development of agriculture and aquaculture reflects the ingenuity and overall capabilities of early Hawaiians. The socio-political complexity before Western contact brought the Hawaiian civilization to its cultural peaks, the likes of which most scholars agree, remain largely unprecedented anywhere else in the Pacific.

**An Archaeological Cultural Sequence**

It is amazing how archaeological evidence, when assisted by linguistics, traditional information and critical thinking, can reconstruct the past in the
most convincing ways. We see that Hawaiian prehistory, upon being divided up into distinct eras, can help to illustrate significant changes and developments from the initial point of human contact to the present. In our efforts to understand Hawai'i's cultural past and the rise and development of the Hawaiian civilization, it is important to establish a sequence of events. Placing specific dates and sequences on human processes is always a challenge. The particular Hawaiian cultural sequence outlined below which is based on the work of noted Pacific anthropologist, Patrick Kirch, is a sound and sensible attempt at reconstructing the past. 76

The Period of Colonization (300 A.D. - 600 A.D.)

During this three hundred year time span, the population grew from some 20-40 people at initial landfall, to as much as a thousand individuals. Settlement was both coastal and windward and the pre-contact ecosystems generally remained intact. Land clearing was minimal and regional. The range of introduced plants and animals had not yet asserted their presence in threatening ways. The society was largely made up of kinship groups who were led by family chiefs. Native birds, fish and shellfish were primary sources of food and the cultural practices and material culture are identifiable as Proto East Polynesian.
The Period of Development (600 A.D. to 1100 A.D.)

During this phase, very important distinctions had developed which identified the inhabitants as different from their Proto East Polynesian ancestors. Settlement was still largely windward and centered in fertile valley areas; however, there was a smattering of leeward occupation. By this time, the settlers had explored their island home thoroughly and had opportunities to observe and experiment with all that was considered new when they first arrived several centuries earlier. There was an increase in pig and dog populations which correspond with agricultural expansion. Hence, we can assume that human population continued to rise. Elaborate fishing gear and modified tools were developed. Shifting cultivation on valley slopes had reached the point where erosion was clearly evident in heavily settled areas. No evidence of irrigation systems have been found from this period, although remnants of small lo‘i near water sources have been uncovered. While many natural ecosystems were still intact, Polynesian introduced flora began to establish themselves in certain regions. The population was probably near 20,000 by the end of this period.

The Period of Expansion (1100 A.D. - 1650 A.D.)

The most significant developments occurred during this era. The shape of fishhooks changed and began to resemble more closely those of the Society Islands. This supports the theory of a second colonization effort,
probably from the Society Islands, during this period. Those new influences probably blended with, rather than dominated what was already developing in Hawai‘i over the centuries. Irrigation systems and dryland field systems reached their peak, and aquaculture production, that is, the construction of fishponds, were all developed within this time span. There was quite literally, an explosion of population resulting from the expansion into leeward areas which possessed unexploited resources. Towards the end of this period, the population was at least 200,000. Socio-politically, there were greater differences in rank between chiefs and common people and an elite class developed. Eventually, the Hawaiian culture became the most stratified of all Polynesian cultures. By this point, virtually all lowland areas on each island were cleared and used for settlement or agricultural purposes. In fact, the division of the land into *ahupua‘a*, and the development of taxation through the *makahiki* festival all occurred within this time.

The distinct development of an elite class of chiefs created a demand for massive food production and prestige goods. During this period, forest birds were heavily exploited for their feathers which were used to make a variety of royal symbols. A chief’s efficacy as a leader was clearly dependent on his ability to produce food and goods for his retinue of specialists and experts as well as for the *maka‘āinana* who served him. Taro cultivation and dryland field systems were pushed to their limit. The aquacultural technology behind fishponds grew to its cultural peak. All fishponds were
exclusively associated with the chiefs and were exploited by them as symbols of prestige as well. Production on all levels were most intense by the end of this period and well into the next. By the seventeenth century, the areas settled by people, were for the most part, completely different landscapes from when the first humans arrived a thousand years earlier.

The Period of Proto-history (1650 A.D. - 1795 A.D.)

This period of a century and a half is marked by significant changes in political rule. Within this time period, the land was controlled by a few chiefly lines who engaged in constant warfare in an effort to conquer or maintain territory. This period covers the time just prior to and shortly following the advent of Western contact and essentially ends with the conquering of O'ahu by Kamehameha I. When Captain Cook arrived, he saw an intensely cultivated environment ruled by an exclusive class of elite chiefs. The ingenuity of the Hawaiian people impressed the Westerners, and understandably so. For to yield and harvest such bounty from one of the most isolated spots on earth may truly be among one of humankind's greatest achievements.

A Hawaiian Cultural Sequence

There is truly no single Hawaiian cultural sequence. The following is basically a native approach to the ordering of the world. In addition, a
number of ancestral figures are mentioned which illustrate Hawaiian and Tahitian connections.

According to the Kumulipo tradition, Po, or “night” existed before anything was ever created.* It was a void, a chaotic pre-existence which eventually became ordered through the event of creation. This activity began at a time when the Earth was hot and the heavens unfolded from within. The primordial slime, caused the Earth to be firm and all these events happened in darkness. Metaphorically, the poetic imagery in the birth of the world reflects the birth of a human child. Po is very much like a womb that is filled with birthing water, and the pangs of childbirth are echoed in the movements of the dark churning fluids. 77

Sea creatures are born and become connected to counterparts on land. Seaweeds and mosses take shape and land plants eventually sprout. All of this growth takes place in darkness. Soon, endless varieties of fish and other sea creatures are born. Forest vegetation begins to rise up and both land and sea birds are born. 78

Finally, the light breaks forth as La‘ila‘i, the first woman, is born. She is joined by three males, Ki‘i, the first man, and the deities, Kāne and Kanaloa. After several generations, Haumea is born. The two brothers from whom a number of other Polynesian peoples trace descent, ‘Ulu and Nana‘ulu, are

---

*The Kumulipo is a genealogical chant of creation which is over 2,000 lines long. It is believed to have been composed by Keaulumoku for the high chief Ka‘i‘iiamamao in the early eighteenth century.
born. Shortly after, the different Maui brothers are born. Papa, the maternal Earth, and Wākea, the paternal heavens appear. Hāloa, the taro-child is born and the rest of the Hawaiian race is born. 79

Throughout Hawaiian cosmology, the dualism of male and female counterparts is a prominent theme which illustrates the indigenous belief in a natural balance, not unlike the Eastern "yin-yang." It is also important to understand that man is not a central figure in creation. He is part of larger scheme and is expected to play his role in the overall paradigm of life. 80

There are many traditions which mention the arrival of chiefs from Kahiki, the distant homeland of the Hawaiian people. Although Kahiki is considered to be a general term for "a distant land," most identify it as Tahiti. The chief, Maweke is believed to have arrived from North Tahiti with his family sometime during the eleventh or twelfth centuries. They are remembered for being the progenitors of a number of chiefly lines. Pa‘ao, a priest from Tahiti who landed at Puna, is credited with the building of the Mo‘okini heiau in Kohala and is said to have introduced human sacrifice and walled heiau to Hawai‘i. It is also said that when the chiefs had become degraded, he sailed to Tahiti and brought back Pili to serve as a paramount chief. From Pili descends the ruling class of Hawaiian chiefs. Mo‘ikeha was a celebrated voyager from Tahiti who settled on Kaua‘i sometime during the twelfth century. His son Kila was sent to Tahiti to fetch his half-brother, La‘amaikahiki. La‘amaikahiki introduced image worship to Hawai‘i

67
according to one tradition, and is also credited with bringing the *pahu*, (drum) and *hula* to Hawai‘i. Kaha‘i is known throughout the Pacific as a fine navigator. Traditions indicate that he traveled to ‘Upolu in Kahiki, to gather ‘*ulu* (breadfruit) which he brought back and planted in Hawai‘i. 81

Indigenous concepts of cultural development might tend to focus around chiefly figures, both historical and legendary, who may have accomplished certain feats or were remembered for particular attributes. Cosmologically, the Kumulipo is but one of a number of genealogies which describe the birth of the world and concurrently glorify particular lineages. While there are a multiplicity of native approaches to history, these are intended to be some examples of what might be meaningful to Hawaiians, from a Hawaiian perspective.

**Developments Towards Stratification**

Both linguistic and ethnographic comparisons with other Eastern Polynesian societies strongly suggest that during the early years of colonization, the social organization of the initial settlers basically consisted of corporate descent groups whose leadership was determined by a system of hereditary chieftainship. 82 These decent groups were essentially relatives, extended family units, who shared common ancestry and whose family network served as the interdependent work force which facilitated the survival of the respective clans. We might assume that certain ancestral
concepts such as *mana* and *kapu* were a part of their social fabric and that both the low density of their population and the abundance of avian and marine food sources might have allowed for a somewhat "peaceful" existence.

There was probably very little difference between chiefs and followers in terms of dress, behavior and attitude and the intense regulatory code of *kapu* which was firmly in operation in the eighteenth century had not yet been developed. Religious rites were probably led by the chief, his brothers or even the elders of the clan. The chief probably led the fishing effort and then distributed the catch evenly among his family, with of course, the proper initial offerings (first-fruits tribute) to the gods.

As time passed and the population steadily increased, higher yields from resources were needed to sustain more people. The few slips, roots and seeds of food plants brought by the founders had become well established and were capable of producing the greater yields of food required. There was also the typical corresponding rise in the amount of pig and dog consumption. People began to explore new territories and were able to exploit untapped resources which in turn, continued to facilitate population growth.

As family-oriented governance continued, it became increasingly necessary to maintain a sense of control over resources and manpower to maintain the necessary flow of goods and services throughout society. The inherent politics in the management of people and the distribution of goods gave rise to the development of a system based on roles, status and rank.
Some acknowledge a link between this significant political development and what archaeologists have identified as a series of arrivals from the Society Islands, sometime between 1000 A.D. and 1250 A.D. Whether or not the shift in political structure was locally stimulated, introduced from the Societies, or perhaps a combination of both, it is fairly clear that the communal family-oriented nature of Hawaiian society which characterized the first eight hundred to a thousand years of existence was eventually replaced by a system of classes which afforded rights of control and access to those with chiefly status.

Linguistic research reveals the use of the term *ali‘i* as a cognate of the pan-Polynesian term for “chief.” In its archaic usage, *ali‘i* refers to the chief’s “first born.” The *ali‘i*, as a distinct class of chiefs became separated from the common class of citizens. Within the chiefly class developed an internal hierarchy of positions which were tied to the politics of pedigree. At the helm of society was the *ali‘i nui*, the paramount chiefs, whose genealogies afforded them the “rights” to be treated as gods. Generally, these chiefs were so *kapu* that people prostrated themselves in their presence. Their chiefly shadows were easily defiled by the “common-ness” of the world around them and death would be the consequence for anyone who even innocently, made such unfortunate contact. These “gods on earth” had under them a complex system of chiefly generals and officials who assisted the paramount chiefs in managing the ‘āina, the land.
The paramount chief was advised by a counselor called *kālaimoku*, who was often a brother or cousin of the *ali‘i nui*. A second class of *ali‘i* included those of lesser lineages called *kaukau ali‘i* as well as the land managers, or *konohiki*. The *ali‘i* could trace their genealogical relationships among each other and were essentially, a “family of rulers.” It was this second class of chiefs, the *konohiki*, who collected the produce from the land and sea and who ensured that productivity was high. They regulated water use, land use and enforced the complex *kapu* system on behalf of the paramount chief. 87

There were also priests, *kahuna*, who officiated at temple ceremonies and *kāula* or prophets who divined the future on behalf of the *ali‘i*. Their roles were significant in that they could influence the decision and actions of the paramount chief by initiating religious obligations. A completely distinct class of experts who carried the same title of *kahuna*, served as the keepers of specialized knowledge. These specialists were consulted in home building, canoe building, farming, fishing, healing and so forth. While they did not possess the same kind of clout as their priestly counterparts, and were really considered closer to commoners than chiefs, it was to every chief’s advantage to have in his retinue a range of experts whose knowledge could be utilized at the whim and will of the paramount chief.

The vast majority of the population consisted of the commoners, the *maka‘āinana*. When describing the commoner class, it is hard to avoid
provincial European images of medieval feudalism which is often used as a comparison by historians. Cognate forms of the term maka‘āinana are prevalent throughout Polynesia and tend to included notions of common descent and ancestral association with a particular region or land division. 88

Notwithstanding the status differential between chiefs and commoners, it is important to note that traditionally, the efficacy of a chief was directly related to his ability to feed his people and to meet their needs. It was the ali‘i’s responsibility to care for the land and to allow its use to be of benefit to all of society. This condition, when operating at its optimum would be referred to as pono, meaning “balanced, right, good.” In spite of the fact that a deferential relationship existed between the “workers of the land” and the chief, clearly the system at its best, was intended to be cooperative. 89 Traditional stories recall the misdeeds of unscrupulous ruling chiefs who had oppressed their maka‘āinana. Typical story lines include, that following rebellion, an evil chief might be replaced by a generous, caring chief who was sometimes an estranged younger sibling or cousin of inferior rank. 90 To balance the allegations of some that the ali‘i class were categorically oppressive and tyrannical is the traditional perspective that ali‘i were in fact very beloved by their maka‘āinana and are often thought of in intimate terms throughout the nineteenth century and even until today. 91

Foreign understandings of the relationship between the upper and lower classes caused Westerners to view homage and service to the ali‘i as a
condition for makaʻāinana to maintain their land. However, traditionally, it was the aliʻi who moved about from place to place, and it was the fixed-makaʻāinana class who fed and clothed the aliʻi. The latter was indebted to the former and was tasked with keeping the community pono. 92 In 1841, William Richards describes pre-Western Hawaiian land tenure in a report to Captain Charles Wilkes of the U.S. Expedition, by saying:

...among all the better classes it was considered improper to evict the direct cultivators of the land and hence it was often the case that all the different ranks of chiefs were dispossessed, while the last dependents, the cultivators of the soil were continued in their possessions. 93

Hence, aliʻi - makaʻāinana relationships were fundamentally different from the aristocrat/nobles and peasant/serfs of feudal Europe.

The outcasts of society, the kauā, were a class of ill-repute. They are sometimes described as the violators of kapu, the descendants of the vanquished tribes of early aboriginals or the former inhabitants of conquered regions. There seems to be a sense that kauā was a hereditary status. There is no evidence that they were laborers or that they contributed at all to Hawaiian society. They served as potential sacrificial victims when such religious obligations arose. They may have had their own compounds away from the rest of society and were presumably marked with some physical indicator, perhaps a special tattoo, labeling them as “untouchables.” Other uses of the term kauā suggest a meaning of “servant” as in the relationship between
lesser chiefs and higher ranking chiefs, and especially in biblical contexts where all “servants of God” may be referred to as kauā. Aside from their use as sacrificial offerings and the defilement of kapu which may occur as a result of making contact with them, the kauā probably did not make any noteworthy impact on the socio-political or economic conditions of early Hawai‘i.94

Simultaneous with the evolution of politics and government came new concepts regarding how land should be divided. The concept of ahupua‘a which were ideally, but not always, valleys or “mountain to the sea” divisions, may have developed as a by-product of stratification. The community network required for the successful exploitation of resources from a variety of environmental regimes made the ahupua‘a an effective means by which society could operate and be controlled. The former system of land tenure was communal whereby the community as a whole maintained rights to the land. This changed, however, and was replaced by a system where all lands and land use came under the control of the ali‘i.

The Politics of Production and Distribution

It is hard to know whether increased population was the impetus for the development of highly efficient production systems or whether the effectiveness of the technology had facilitated population growth. Perhaps the development was cyclical. In any event, it is most clear that wet and dry land cultivation and aquaculture were capable of producing enormous
amounts of food. David Stannard and others feel that this fact alone is the most compelling piece of evidence which supports the theory that the Hawaiian islands had supported a population of nearly a million people in pre-Western times. In Stannard's words:

...not even considering the other half of the "double larder," the resources of the sea -- pre-haole Hawai'i' easily could have fed over a million people with less than two percent of the land being put into combined dry-land and wet-land taro production. In short, it does not stretch the imagination a bit to suggest that in pre-haole times Hawai'i attained a probable population density at least in the 125 to 150 people per square mile range. 95

However, Marshall Sahlins, Patrick Kirch and those of similar mind believe that the high yield of food was really the result of a purposeful surplus production. The highly stratified Hawaiian society created situations where the "ali'i - distributors," in efforts to acquire status and to support their large retinues of specialists, placed heavy (some would say, abusive) demands on the "maka'āinana -producers." Hence, production was intensified for political reasons, and may not necessarily have benefitted the community at large, according to many Pacific archaeologists. 96

In reality, these two theories are not entirely at odds with each other. That is, it is plausible that both conditions might have co-existed. However, it is important to understand that the chiefly role of "distributor" was seriously impacted by the development of highly stratified societal classes. The "paternal" chief who divided out portions of fish among his family during
the first millennia of settlement, had evolved into a sacred paramount “god-chief” in whose presence people would prostrate and for whom choice catches from fishponds were retrieved to feed royal retainers. Notwithstanding this evolution which created the high production demands from ali‘i circles, it is probable that the traditional role of goods distribution continued to be performed by the head or leader within maka‘āinana households as well.

Over time, the ali‘i, the kahuna or specialists, and the royal retainers discontinued their participation in the production efforts of society leaving the entire burden on the maka‘āinana citizenry. The livelihoods of these specialists were directly dependent on the efficacy of their respective chiefs to provide for them. Hence, the chiefly role of “collector” of goods developed. The makahiki festival with its ritual collection of annual “taxes” for the fertility god, Lono, is the best example of this. To ensure the fertility of the land and a highly productive harvest, the maka‘āinana offered tribute, or ho‘okupu (to cause to sprout), to the ali‘i nui who was conceptually, Lono-incarnate. Konohiki, land managers, monitored productivity and perhaps, as some argue, may have oppressed the maka‘āinana into producing a surplus to support the chiefly class.

The passing of goods was indeed an extremely important feature of Hawaiian society. Those who had access to marine resources offered what they had to those who possessed agricultural resources, and vice versa. Sometimes, the offerings were in the form of large group community service,
as in the construction of *hale* (houses) or *wa’a* (canoes). Goods and services were offered as contributions and did not necessarily carry with them the same kind of immediate “dollar for dollar” exchange rate as implied through terms such “trade” and “barter.” There was no negotiation involved. Rather, people simply gave what they had, when they had, and were satisfied to receive what was offered. Linnekin explains: “...the prevalence of exchange-in-kind...confirms the general principle that different things travel in different directions and at different times...the donor can be confident that the gift will be reciprocated at a later date, and with a different sort of item.” 97 Sahlins refers to this as “generalized reciprocity.” 98 Society was guided by a code of pride versus shame which placed *mana* in the possession of those who gave generously, and retracted *mana* from those who did not. While Hawaiian cultural agreements allowed one to expect reciprocation in some fashion, to complain or to ask for something in return was bad form. That this system worked and was able to effectively facilitate the large-scale operation of traditional Hawaiian society for centuries appears to be an important differentiating factor between traditional Hawaiian society and Western capitalism.

This sense of balance in society is also reflected in the traditional belief in *ali‘i* as “chiefly providers” who were “obligated” to see that the needs of society were met. This fundamentally involved ensuring the productivity of the ‘āina (land) by caring for it, and by giving proper attention to spiritual
obligations on behalf of the community. When balance, or pono was achieved and maintained, the population thrived.

**Ho‘okipa: An Ancestral Ideology**

It would be fairly safe to state that hospitality is a social expression of welcome that is indeed universal. But the way a particular society or culture “dresses it up” using its own indigenous symbols, metaphors, conditions and values, reflects the psyche -- the emotional identity of its people. Polynesian culture was the result of a connected series of courageous departures and victorious landfalls over the course of millennia. Hence, we might expect to recognize certain themes as we replay the entire Austronesian overture -- a range of symphonic movements comprising some 4,000 years of Pacific island hospitality.

When Lapita peoples sailed between the Bismarcks, Solomons, Vanuatu and New Caledonia bearing obsidian, chert and pottery, what rituals of greeting were observed? Ideas of exchange and “boundary crossing” must have been well known by those early peoples. The Eastern Lapita Cultural Complex centered around a web of regular interaction between Fiji, Tonga and Samoa. Again, opportunities for the display of ritual protocol would have presented themselves at every landfall. Visitors would have been housed and fed on a regular basis. Frequent contact was the mechanism by which items and ideas for survival were passed around.
With regard to exchange systems, Douglas Oliver wrote:

The goods that entered into...external exchanges were of both tangible and intangible types. Tangible ones include raw materials, food (including, in some places, human bodies), garments and body ornaments, tools and weapons, utensils, boats, magical and medical ingredients, “money,” and so forth....intangible goods were magical formulae, songs, dances, ritual scenarios, labor of various kinds, fighting assistance, verbal praise and other forms of respect and -- very important and almost ubiquitous -- the several types of services characteristic of women: domestic, sexual, and reproductive.99

In some parts of Melanesia, certain rules were established for gift-exchange. Partnerships were established with a network of individuals with whom regular exchanges of goods took place. Some refer to these partners as trade-friends. Each participant was expected to remain with and protect their own respective trade-friends. Stealing another’s partner was an offense. All gifts had to be graciously received with no grudges. Finally, exchanges never happen simultaneously. Obligation should never appear as an extrinsic attribute of the exchange. One must return the gift at another time.100 One wonders if Lapita people also exchanged goods among trade-friends, and if similar rules were observed. On the Micronesian island of Pohnpei, islanders “did not trade; they gave. In giving, they earned for themselves return gifts.”101 These conditions are similar to Polynesian concepts of gift-giving etiquette.

To the Huli tribe of New Guinea, it was important to have pigs available for transactions. As they crossed boundaries, the Huli offered pigs to
demonstrate their personal sense of worth. Their relationships with neighboring villages were augmented through the offering of pigs. In a way, the animal was a kind of money and could be used to “purchase” certain goods and services. 102

Another example of Oceanic commerce was the kula trading system which featured necklaces and arm-shells that were also a kind of money. They were exchanged by southeastern Papuan natives who were dispersed along a ring of coastal communities. The shells were used “in payment for food, canoes, assassinations, and so on...” and were also capable of possessing spiritual qualities.103

In the Carolines, the islands of Lamotrek, Elato and Satawal were connected through an inter-atoll exchange system. Tribute was offered to the high ranking chiefs of the islands on a seasonal basis. Items such as coconuts and preserved breadfruit were distributed throughout the island. These regular tributes bought them support in the event of a natural disaster and also helped them to negotiate for the use of certain fishing areas during food shortages. William Alkire has termed this kind of exchange system a “coral complex.” 104 Generally, boundary crossing and exchange systems can be found throughout the Pacific and are part of an ancient Oceanic tradition of connected-ness and interdependency.

When the first canoes left Western Polynesia and settled the remote eastern regions of the Pacific, a “regional homeland” comprised of the
Marquesas and Society Islands (and possibly the Tuamotus and the Cooks) enjoyed a similar interactivity. What were some of the basic elements of hospitality during those exchanges? When the first canoes sailed north to Hawai‘i from the Marquesas, they took with them notions about exchange and how people should treat each other. Those ideas would become part of the unique Hawaiian culture that would develop over the succeeding centuries.

Further influenced, perhaps, by the perspectives of Society Islanders upon their arrival in Hawai‘i sometime in the eleventh or twelfth centuries, ideas about ho‘okipa continued to evolve. Traditions indicate that a number of chiefly figures from the Society Islands brought political and religious institutions to Hawai‘i at different points within this era. The likely period of arrival for Society Island voyagers is in fact, the same point in time that significant changes occurred locally. Society became increasingly more stratified, and concepts of land divisions in relationship to production requirements developed especially after the fourteenth century.

What is imperative here is to understand that social processes such as “exchange” and “hospitality” are in essence, legacies of ideas, beliefs and values, which in this case, are connected together by a common people -- the Polynesians. Their need to survive within Pacific island environments that possessed limited resources shaped their views and practices of hospitality.
When considering the dynamic development of traditional Hawaiian culture, as always, a number of queries surface which beg to be addressed. How might expressions of hospitality in 500 A.D., which is some two centuries after the initial arrival of early Marquesans, have compared with practices in 1100 A.D., the approximate point of arrival of colonizers from the Society Islands? Had practices changed drastically by the time Capt. Cook arrived in 1778? Did the “rules” of ho‘okipa change as the socio-political structure became more stratified? What is it about ho‘okipa that makes it uniquely Hawaiian? For obvious reasons, we may never know the answers to these questions. However, as we come to know more about Hawaiian concepts of ho‘okipa, we may consider a number of plausible ideas and theories which can point us in the right direction.

We know that initial settlement was, for the most part, coastal and centered around windward locales where water was abundant. Marine and avi-fauna resources would have been very accessible and heavily exploited. The well-watered windward lands would have facilitated the successful propagation of the food plants brought on arrival. Because the fairly small populations were still living together in self-contained coastal compounds and were guided by the head of the household, we might assume that the work force necessary for subsistence survival was essentially an extended family unit which did not have to “cross boundaries” to provide for themselves. Hence, we can further assume that the “exchange” of goods was
minimal and was instead, a largely internal process of sharing the “catch of the day.” Everyone knew each other and were members of a descent group, making them essentially, relatives. Therefore, in those early centuries, there were probably few strangers or newcomers to deal with formally or ceremonially.

As the population increased, more “boundaries” were needed to identify territory, property and status. People moved inland to settle and were able to tap into unexploited resources. At that point, expressions of hospitality and exchange probably became more frequent as the need to travel farther to obtain goods increased. There were more mouths to feed and more chiefly household heads to deal with. Efforts in distribution probably became more complex and political which led to a more serious, or perhaps, more structured perception of hospitality protocol. There were more reasons for people to travel between kauhale and across boundaries which made ho'okipa, the manner in which they were received by hosts, an indicator of successful political relations.

By the time society became highly stratified, the population had increased enormously. Lo‘i kalo (taro fields) lined the floors of virtually every valley that possessed a water source and the islands had been divided up into mini-chieftdoms. Politics, economics, religion and warfare became severely entangled making the crossing of “boundaries” both physically and socially, much more challenging. A specific code of behavior was required as people
continued to interact socially. *Ho'okipa* may have become more formalized and "institutionalized" by this time.

The ruling chiefs and the entire echelon of nobility probably expressed *ho'okipa* with more ceremony and pageantry. The *ali'i* often sponsored *hālau hula* (dance schools) to entertain guests, and had direct access to food sources and status goods. Hence, it would be fairly easy for a chief to present fifty pigs, layers of finely woven mats, bolts of scented *kapa* (bark cloth), and have a *mele inoa* (name chant) composed and danced for special visitors. For the *maka'āinana*, it may be assumed that a less ceremonious expression of *ho'okipa* was maintained among themselves. This was reflected in the mutual dependency between upland producers and marine producers, and was facilitated through the self-contained *ahupua'a* land division. Indeed, it was this network of relationships that connected them with other parts of society and which served as the mechanism for their collective survival.

Do we classify hospitality as "goods" or "services"? Indeed, there are reasons to believe that it can be both: "goods" in the form of gifts and food, and "services" through the provision of housing and deferential treatment. But like the fisherman who offered choice mullet to his upland neighbors after receiving bundles of *lī'au* (taro leaves) from them the week before, so was hospitable treatment, *ho'okipa*, provided spontaneously to *malihini* (newcomers) as the needs arose. For on countless other occasions, the *malihini* themselves had played the role of host and had welcomed numerous
travelers into the warmth of their own homes. This “cycle of hospitality” was a form of exchange which was practiced between hosts and visitors. As we shall see more specifically in chapter three, *ho'okipa* was very much a way of thinking, an institutionalized code of behavior characterized by sincere gestures of spontaneous generosity.
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CHAPTER III
THE RITUAL OF HO'OKIPA

Contexts for Ho'okipa

An act of politeness or courtesy has meaning because the members of the society in which it occurs have agreed on its worth. Agreements are sanctioned in a positive manner when they are upheld, and in a negative manner when breached. Politeness, as a behavioral agreement, implies that one makes a conscious choice to behave in a deferential way. In today's society, we would tend to agree that being polite is desirable and would strive to affect our own personal behavior to emulate that shared agreement. However, we are not forced to be polite -- contemporary society allows us to decide on our own how to behave. In simple terms, a smile given, does not require a smile returned; saying "please" is polite, but does not license a more quantitative or expeditious access to society's goods and services. We cannot assume that we will be treated better because we are polite. Within the parameters of what is lawfully and ethically acceptable, the manner in which we are treated is ultimately in the hands of the party with whom we interact. With this idea in mind, hospitality in a traditional Hawaiian context appears to be far more than just an act of politeness.

In earlier times, long-distance travel between districts or islands took many days, and in some cases, weeks. Efficient travel by canoe depended on
the quality of the vessel, manpower and good weather. All these being optimum, canoe travel between Hilo, Hawai'i and Lahaina, Maui could easily take a couple of days. Land travel potentially included a whole topographical range of terrains, climates and conditions, all of which were traveled on foot: dense rain forests, sheer mountain ridges, as well as vast arid fields of jagged 'a'a lava. Whether traveling in a large group as in the case of ali'i (royalty) or pū'ali koa (warriors bands), or when traveling alone, one's destination was often a considerable distance away requiring a relative amount of travel time.

To prepare for such travel, an ordinary man or woman might take some sort of pū'olo (bundle) containing personals, though this would not amount to much in former times. An essential travel item would be a huewai (water gourd), which was attached to a cord and hung over the shoulder. Water could easily be replenished at a spring or stream in small quantities. This alone, however, was not sufficient to sustain a traveler over many days. Except for a small quantity of food at the outset of the journey, it is most unreasonable to imagine that one could carry any significant amount of nutrition sufficient for more than a day or so. With travel as a fairly common occurrence, Hawaiian society was challenged to address the issue of survival and sustenance when traveling away from one's home territory.2

Traditional stories of hospitality recorded in the nineteenth century and the childhood remembrances of today's kūpuna (elders) both speak comparably regarding the practice of ho'okipa. Whether family, friends or
complete strangers, it was a custom to extend hospitality to all visitors. A 
commonly referred to scenario describes malihini (strangers) passing by the 
home of a kama'āina (a local resident). From within the home, a voice calls 
out to the malihini inviting them inside to eat. The visitors, of course, accept 
the invitation. The simplicity of this hypothetical description of hospitality 
is deceiving. In reality, there existed certain obligations and expectations, 
which were rarely if ever referred to overtly in the course of welcoming 
visitors. And yet, to disregard these societal agreements -- these “unwritten 
rules” which are codified in often casual-looking ritual, could cause 
misunderstandings and great offense.

In a traditional Hawaiian kauhale (multi-unit compound), separate 
thatched structures comprised one’s “home.” Among the twenty or thirty 
members of a typical household, it was likely that someone would notice 
approaching travelers. It was the duty of the heads of the household to 
authorize a call out to the visitor to enter the kauhale to eat and rest. The 
malihini, upon hearing the call, or heahea, were expected to respond 
affirmatively. In a way, the visitors were as obligated to accept the invitation, 
as the kama'āina were in issuing the invitation to begin with. Early accounts 
mention greetings being offered along the road side with invitations to 
passersby to enjoy bananas, coconut or perhaps melon. In situations where it 
was imperative for the travelers to continue on their journey, they might try 
to stay out of view and avoid passing by residences. Or, they might choose to
stop briefly, in which case, they were obligated to express very sincerely, their embarrassment for staying such a short period of time. While this would generally be accepted by the hosts (although, not without some disappointment or friendly annoyance), the traveling malihini still ran the risk of offending the kama‘āina, as well as being called ho’okano (haughty). On the other hand, if they chose to stop and accept the invitation, they could guarantee that food would be prepared and that they would have a place to rest. Frequently, visitors stayed overnight, or for an extended period of time and were often given the most comfortable sleeping areas in the household. Some regions held it as customary to entertain visitors with hula. When ready, the malihini thanked their hosts, left some token of appreciation, and continued on their way.

Should a meaningful relationship develop from this exchange, the visitors may, from that point on, refer to their kama‘āina hosts as makamaka. Its meaning can be loosely translated as “friends” or “hosts” but is more accurately, a combination of both; it recognizes a relationship that has developed from, and maintained through hospitality. In many cases, the two parties may continue to visit each other’s homes on occasion which would further reify their relationship as makamaka. Today, the term is often used erroneously to refer to other kinds of relationships, or to friends, in general. However, the proper context for its use is through the reciprocity of the ho’okipa experience.
The custom of honi or honi ihu has been translated as "to smell" or "to kiss" in the Western sense. However, the traditional Hawaiian practice involved breathing in while touching noses. Some descriptions indicate that the lips also touched without movement, and the action was also accompanied by an embrace. Honi was a meaningful exchange between loved ones as well as towards visitors, indicating a bond of love and affection had been created. Noted historian, John Papa 'Ii, who was groomed from birth to serve in the royal court, remembers the sad departure from his family as a young boy. He converses with his mother:

"What must I do when I long for you and for my father, now that we are separating? Perhaps we shall never live together again." His mother said, "Do not think of us. The chief alone must be your father and your mother. From him shall come your vegetable food, your meat, your tapa coverings, and malos." The boy asked, "May I not come and see you sometimes when you are as near as you are now?" "It will be all right to do so at the proper time," she replied, "but it would be much better for you to remain with the chief with no thought of us, whether we be as near as we are now or far away." While they talked, the sun passed to the opposite side of Mount Kaala, and his mother said, "Night has come for you." "Homai ka ihu (embrace me; literally, give the nose)," replied the boy. Thus ended their living together, and the boy stood up and went to the residence of the chief.

In other Polynesian settings, honi took place among everyone, regardless of gender or age, and it was socially acceptable for men to honi among themselves. The New Zealand Maori hongi is still practiced widely among the Maori as well as on marae (ancestral gathering place). It is probably a
good example of the Hawaiian honi which has since been replaced by the Western kiss for well over a century. However, while the style of kissing has changed, its practice remains an important custom. In fact, even today, one can be chastised for failing to honi all of one’s relatives at a family function, or upon departing from a social event without “kissing goodbye.” When malihini visited, it was be very appropriate to greet them and bid farewell with a honi.

Throughout the hosting process, conscious efforts were made to project a sincere sense that the visitors’ presence was an honor, and that the hosts’ efforts were generous and greatly appreciated. The lack of these expressions, or even the slightest implication that conditions were less than adequate, could create a feeling of awkwardness and be immediately perceived as offensive to either party. On the other hand, hospitality at its best, was praised and remembered. In 1810, the advisors of Kamehameha the Great decided to arrange a meeting between their king and the ruler of Kaua’i, Kaumuali‘i. Desiring to seize Kaua’i Island, they concocted a plot to lure the Kaua’i sovereign to O’ahu, to kill him. However, ʻI‘i records, “...Kamehameha did not approve of the plot, for he had often heard of the hospitality accorded to the chiefs of the eastern islands when they went to Kaua’i.”

It is important to understand that the hosts’ invitation and the visitors’ acceptance were more than just acts of politeness. Each was expected to act
out their respective roles in accordance with the "unwritten rules" of Hawaiian society. The honor and status attached to being hospitable encouraged people to be generous hosts. At the same time, each member of society recognized that at some point, they would play both the roles of "visitor" and "host" throughout their lives. Hence, ho'okipa, must be essentially understood as an institutionalized ritual of hospitality -- a combination of civil obligation, social etiquette, status acquisition and sincerity.

At a very basic level, simple greetings were never taken lightly. "Aloha!" or "Aloha mai!" meaning "Greetings!" might be used casually upon seeing someone on the road. Today, adding the appropriate pronouns are very common as in "Aloha kāua!" (Greetings between you and I!) and "Aloha kākou!" (Greetings among three or more of us!) One might also say "Ke aloha nō!" whether greeting or departing. Some prefer the less-used "'Ano'ai!" which is usually used to greet more than three people at a time, while others use "Welina!" an older, more archaic form of greeting. Acknowledgment of others was a matter of love and respect.

There were many different circumstances which called for some form of hospitality or another in early times. Some were anticipated and could be planned in advance; others occurred more spontaneously. If a high chief was traveling down the west coast of Hawai'i with his retinue, each of the coastal fishing villages would probably be made aware of it and would prepare in
advance to receive the entourage. During festivals such as the *Makahiki*, ceremonies for the building of *heiau luakini* (temples of high worship), or even following major battles, large numbers of people gathered and needed to be fed and sheltered over an extended period of time. Spontaneous occasions on the other hand, involved the unexpected arrival of strangers, or the unanticipated visit by family or friends who happen to be passing through.

A French explorer, de Freycinet, who visited Hawai‘i only a few weeks after Kamehameha I’s death in 1819, observed that the return of a friend or a ranking individual was marked by “simulated or real weeping.” He describes two chiefs who “embraced each other in the manner of the country, then started to sob while rolling on the ground and uttering loud cries with all the outward manifestations of profound grief.” 12 He also records that songs of praise were often composed on the spot. The return of a young man named Mauae to his village after being gone a number of years, is described in the following:

As soon as they saw him, the entire population ran out to greet him. The customary weeping and embraces took place; he was adorned with flower wreathes and scented garlands; his father, brothers, sisters, all his relatives in a word, demonstrated with touching caresses the joy they felt at seeing him back again. After this demonstration, a group of young men intoned a chant in his praise and in praise of his family, whose history the poet had in a way retraced.13

---

* Rev. William Ellis also recorded this event which can be found in *Journal of William Ellis* (1963: 191). The homecoming took place in Kaimū, Hawai‘i, Mauae’s birthplace.
Elements of Ho'okipa

No matter what the occasion, a ritualized combination of certain elements made the hospitality process “proper” by virtue of its adherence to the codes of accepted Hawaiian behavior. An attempt has been made to identify and define those elements. It is important to understand that inherent in the social scientific practice of categorizing and compartmentalizing ideas and concepts for analysis, is the deconstruction and disassembly of functionally-attached entities that can potentially depreciate or transmutate in meaning and value as a result. These elements are: heahea, mea ‘ai, kuleana, le'ale'a and makana. A conscious effort to understand these entities in their appropriate interactive contexts is essential.

Heahea: Call of Welcome

Heahea can be defined as a “call of welcome.” Its form may vary but is most often heard as a chanted or spoken invitation. It was largely spontaneous with no specific or standard repertoire. Generally, it was the responsibility of the host to heahea to the approaching visitors. Upon seeing them, a member of the household might call out, “He mai...e komo mai ‘oukou....e komo mai i loko o kauhale...e hele mai e ‘ai,” which means “Come....Enter, all of you....enter the house.....come and eat.” The visitors would graciously respond with a spontaneous “Ae...aloha nō.” meaning “Yes...greetings, affection...” or anything that would communicate a sense of
gratefulness and appreciation. In cases where the visitor's approach went undetected by the hosts, and it was in fact intentional to visit, eat or lodge with the hosts, the visitors might call out a long drawn out, "Ō..." as an indication of their presence, 16 or express with friendly inflections, ""Auhea ka po'e o kauhale nei?"* meaning “I wonder where the people of the house are?” More recently, even “U----i!” meaning, “Your attention please...” might be used; something friendly, but to the point.** Lest they be perceived as inhospitable, the hosts would scurry about to welcome their malihini properly and would respond with apologetic yet sincere invitations to enter.

Members of the household, regardless of gender, would sometimes chant formal heahea. This might consist of a greeting followed by a mele inoa (name chant) which may have been composed for the visitor, or about his homeland. In these cases, it would be appropriate for the “guest of honor” to respond by acknowledging his or her own mele inoa. They might respond with “E ō...!” which is a common reply to the calling of one’s name, or they might offer a certain chant in response.17 Spontaneous verse, or paha, was also used as a heahea.18 It called for an expert command of poetic language and it required the performer to eloquently yet extemporaneously, express his

* Shared by Sarah Nakoa, Hawaiian translator and native speaker, upon entering a vacant office area at her work place. It is a variation of what Puku’i recorded which states, “Auhea kanaka o kauhale nei?” Both have virtually the same meaning.

** Some say “hu--------i!” with a long, drawn out sound, often in falsetto, and then abruptly clipping the last syllable with a descending inflection.
emotions right on the spot. The performance of these kinds of songs and chants, as opposed to casual and brief calls of welcome, were more likely to be expressed if the visitor was a relative or well-known to the hosts. This being the case, the occasion would be characteristically accompanied by uē (crying or wailing) and embracing. A returning or departing loved one might be offered an uē helu, which literally means “to cry out a recounting” of memories, genealogical connections or virtually any emotion that reflected the relationship. These were spontaneous and extremely emotional commentaries delivered in a style resembling that of a person wailing or grieving over a loss. The style and delivery of the basic heahea was largely situational and could change at a moment’s notice. Mary Kawena Puku’i, noted scholar and elder, cites the following as an example of an embellished heahea:

He mai!
He mai e ku’u pua lehua o ka wao
I pōhai ‘ia e nā manu o uka
Ku’u lehua i mohala i ka ua o Hā’ao
Ua ao ka hale nei, ua hiki maila ‘oe
Mai! mai! Eia nō mākou nei

Come!
Come my lehua of the upland woods
Around whom forest birds gather
My lehua, abloom in the Hā’ao rain
This house is lit by your presence
Come! Come, for we are here 21

Formal heahea have been maintained in traditional hula training. ‘Ōlapa (dancers) who have been accepted into the hālau hula (private dance school) are required to stand outside the training area and chant a mele kāhea repeatedly until the kumu hula (dance master), upon hearing the sincerity in

* Translated by Randie K. Fong.
their voices, grants them entry with a *mele komo.* This helped the student to prepare mentally and spiritually before entering the sacred training area. It could very well be that this process also existed in other kinds of formal training as well: canoe making, medicine, etc.

In contemporary situations, the "call and response ritual" is being used more and more frequently. Where great formality is required, the *heahea* takes on more formal attributes. As special guests arrive, they might chant (or have chanted on their behalf) a request to enter. This is quite formal: it suggests that high ranking people may be present and that the business at hand is of importance. This chant is called *mele kāhea* and unlike the typical *heahea,* is initiated by the guests, not the hosts. The responding chant from the hosts, *mele komo,* grants the visitors permission to enter. Under these circumstances, further obligations may be involved but these have less to do with hospitality, and more to do with rank, politics and the ceremonial requirements of the occasion. **22

When the scenarios of formal hospitality and formal training are juxtaposed, we see that the "visitors" and "student apprentices" are essentially counterparts -- they both play subordinate roles requiring them to seek permission through the *mele kāhea.* The "hosts" and the "master

** Shared by Holoua Stender, *kumu hula* at Kamehameha Schools.

**This contemporary practice is happening more frequently in ceremonies organized by Kamehameha Schools and other Hawaiian organizations. It is based largely on traditional *hula* ritual, but has also been inspired by recent exposure to Maori *marae* ritual.
teachers" are likewise viewed as counterparts who play a superior role as indicated by their granting of permission through the mele kōmo. In formal situations, the mele kāhea - mele kōmo ritual was essentially an exchange of passwords; only certain appropriate chants allowed and granted access. Although it seems reasonable to assume that if a spontaneous chant were created on the spot which communicated to the host or master teacher the right information, that person could possibly be granted entrance. However, for the most part, the chants in formal situations were usually based on established repertoire.

A very famous chant for requesting entry is preserved in the epic saga of the fire deity Pele, and her favorite sister, the youthful Hi‘iakaikapoliopoele. Upon landing at Ha‘ena on Kaua‘i, Hi‘iaka arrives at the home of a crippled chief named Malaeha‘akoa, who is out fishing at the time. His wife, Wailuanuiho‘ano, is at home and sees Hi‘iaka and her friends outside their residence, but she fails to heahea them in to eat and rest. 23 Hi‘iaka’s reproof of the misdeed is memorialized in Nathaniel B. Emerson’s version of the following mele kāhea which is still widely used in hula schools today:

```
Kunihi ka mauna i ka la‘i ē
‘O Wai‘ale‘ale lā i Wailua
Huki i luna ka popo ua
o Kawaikini *
Alai ‘ia a‘ela e Nounou
Nalo ka Ipuha‘a
```

The mountain turns the cold shoulder
Facing away from Wailua
Albeit in time of fair weather
Waikini flaunts, toplofty, its rain-cap
And the view is cut off by Nounou
Thus Humility Hill is not seen

* Or Huki a‘ela i ka lani ka papa ‘auwai o Kawaikini meaning, “Drawn up skyward to the level water course of Kawaikini” as practiced in modern times.

105
Nor Kapaʻa’s broad upland plain
You seal your lips and are voiceless
Best to open your mouth and speak

The last two lines are the most significant in the chant and have great meaning to students of hula when seeking permission from their kumu hula to enter the hālau hula. As previously explained, permission to enter as requested through the mele kāhea can be granted only by the host or master teacher through the mele komo. In fact, many consider the mele kāhea incomplete without the accompanying response:

Call out to the person to enter within
To be fed until he can take no more
Here is the payment, a voice
’Tis only a voice

The second line refers to the custom of overwhelming one’s guests with food. It is also a metaphor for the master teacher who “feeds” his students with knowledge until they are ready to ʻūniki (graduate). In the third and fourth lines, the implication of payment refers to the offering of one’s voice, a chant of welcome perhaps, in lieu of a material gift.

---

* Or Mai paʻa i ka leo, he ʻole ka hea mai e, meaning “Do not suppress the voice and prevent the call of ‘invitation.’” In modern practice the chant ends at this point and excludes Emerson’s last line.

** These first two lines are used in speeches of welcome, according to Pukuʻi (1983: 34).
Today, the term *heahea* itself has come to mean "hospitable," as in *kanaka heahea*, "a hospitable person." This suggests that having a reputation for being hospitable assumes that one has called out many a *heahea* to visitors. It has been said that the tradition of *heahea* had virtually disappeared by the 1930s. However, with the advent of Hawaiian culture resurgence in the 1970s, very many traditional practices have been repopularized; among them, the *heahea*, in both the *hula* and *ho'okipa* contexts.

**Mea 'Ai: Food**

The role of *mea 'ai* (food) in Hawaiian culture is diverse and complex and could easily lend itself to a separate and exclusive treatment beyond this discourse. Therefore, in an attempt to narrow the scope to an appropriate focal point, efforts will be made to explore *mea 'ai* as a particular element in *ho'okipa*, that is, the functions of, and attitudes towards food as they relate to hospitality.

The word 'ai as a verb, means "to eat." As a noun, it can be interpreted to mean "food," but refers particularly to *poi* and food plants. *Mea 'ai*, literally means "thing (to) eat," and is the universally accepted term for all types of food. When the suffix -*na* is added to 'ai (eat), the word 'aina is formed meaning "meal." With the invitation to enter one's home came also the invitation to eat: *Hele mai e 'ai!* (Come and eat!) The two were inseparable -- a visit that did not include food was unusual. Eating was not
restricted to regular meal times; the arrival of guests was always an appropriate time to prepare and partake of a meal. ‘Ai a ma‘ona, inu a kena! is a common expression of hospitality which means, “Eat until your are satisfied, drink until quenched!”

Food preparation was an automatic procedure. Upon seeing an approaching visitor, members of the household would immediately begin to prepare food, sometimes even before the guest entered the house. The host did not ask, “Are you hungry?” or “Have you eaten?” These questions would be most inappropriate. The guest might feel obliged to say “Yes” so as not to inconvenience their host. Also, the guest might feel as if he were asking or begging to be fed. In this case, the host might also be perceived as selfish and reluctant to share his food, which is very bad form in Hawaiian culture. Instead, when the food was ready, hands were washed and the host would guide the guests to a place of honor. In 1841, Rev. John D. Paris commented on the hygienic practices of his Ka‘ū hosts: “Then, fingers washed, for Hawaiians eat not except they first wash...”

Whether one is hungry or not is unimportant and is never an issue in the formalities of ho‘okipa. Traditionally, a portion of food was always taken as a gesture of respect. A poi bowl and other dishes were placed between two or three people and all would share from it. This is metaphorical of the

* This is a common phrase said to guests at a party or gathering. It is also found in songs with references to hospitality.
social bonding created in Hawaiian hospitality; the sharing of food from a single calabash. The host would encourage the guest to have second or third helpings and would always refer to there being “plenty of food,” and to “eat until you are satisfied!” In response, it was the visitor’s duty to show gratefulness for the food. Complimenting the cook is a universal means of communicating appreciation. Customarily, no business was discussed during mealtime, or specifically, when the poi bowl was uncovered; at least nothing serious, sensitive or requiring a decision. Hāloa, the son of Wākea (Sky) by his own daughter, Ho’ohōkūkalani, was deformed at birth. After being buried outside near the house, he grew into a taro plant. Since then, out of respect, no discussions take place while the poi bowl is uncovered, lest Hāloa be disturbed.

The honor which a host gained by the act of hospitality was a serious thing. Likewise, the visitor trusted that he would be received hospitably by his hosts just as he had extended hospitality to others who have visited his own home. Everyone understood the work involved in food production and respected mea ‘ai as central in the ho’okipa practice.

Even if a family had very little food to offer, they would place what they had before the visitor. During his two-month circuit of the islands in 1823, Rev. William Ellis recorded the following:

Even the poorest would generally share their scanty dish of potatoes with a stranger. Not to entertain a guest with what they have, is, among themselves, considered reproachful; and there
are many, who, if they had but one pig or fowl in the yard, or one root of potatoes in the garden, would cheerfully take them to furnish a repast friend. 30

In earlier times, ‘awa (Piper methysticum) was widely used as an offering to the gods. A popular mele hula, "Ke Welina Mai Nei" states the following in reference to Kane, god of life:

\[\begin{align*}
Ua \text{ ma'ona 'o Kāne i ka 'awa} & \quad \text{Kāne has had enough 'awa} \\
Ua \text{ kau ke keha i ka uluna} & \quad \text{And the “head” rests upon the pillow} \\
Ua \text{ hi'olani i ka moena} & \quad \text{Reclined upon the mat}
\end{align*}\]

It is mentioned often in chants and stories as being a favorite drink of the ali‘i and a choice offering to one’s ‘aumakua (family guardian). According to some sources, ‘awa was also popular among the common people. Its use brought about feelings of relaxation, and sometimes drowsiness, and was particularly enjoyed together by both visitors and hosts. There is no solid evidence that Hawaiians practiced the kind of formalized ‘awa ceremonies as did the Samoans, Tongans or Fijians. Most references to ‘awa indicate that it was used mainly as an offering in ceremonies, and was preferred by the gods and especially by the ‘aumakua. John B. Whitman, a Honolulu beachcomber about whom very little is known, recorded his observations of a ceremony which took place in the hale mua (men’s house for eating and worship) of an acquaintance sometime between 1813 and 1815:

We accordingly went to his eating house...A baked pig, and a dish of taro were placed before us, the natives drew up in a semi
circle in front and the master of ceremonies or Priest with the arver ['awa] and a calabash took his station in the midst of them... a door keeper...to keep off intruders and the utmost order and regularity oberved. The Priest handing to each of the natives a portion of the root repeated a long exhortation or prayer in a rapid manner peculiar to them, while the others were chewing it which when sufficiently masticated was put into a calabash and clear water poured upon it. It was then strained through clean grass and a portion of the liquor handed to each of us as we sat on the mats in front of the chewers...Now the Priest commenced a long exclamatory pronounciation of our letter R continuing it as long as his breath held out, then recommencing he pronounced this charm in the same manner Ar-pu-a [?] the last sound being short and quick was a signal to drink the nauseous potion which we accomplished with heaving stomachs and determined obstinacy. Immediately after drinking we partook of the pig and taro and ate heartily as is their custom after taking arver.  

Perhaps the 'awa, pig and taro may have been offerings to the 'aumakua (family guardian), a practice which took place regularly in the hale mua. In any event, it is without question that the use of 'awa was held in high regard from traditional times and throughout the early nineteenth century.

In 1819, Kamehameha II (Liholiho) sat and ate with his mother, the sacred Keopuolani, and his politically-powerful stepmother, Kaʻahumanu. This act was called 'ainoa (tabu-free eating) and marked the descent of traditional Hawaiian society. It also represented to Hawaiians “that the old Akua had lost a good deal of their mana.” 32 From this point on, all men and women could eat together and the kapu (restrictions) on food, which largely disenfranchised women, was lifted. Prior to the abolition of the Kapu System, it was a cultural requirement for men and women to eat separately.
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The men of the household would retire to the *hale mua* (men’s house for eating and worship) and the women and children to the *hale ʻaina* (eating house). Boys at about seven years of age were *kā i mua*, or “thrusted into the men’s house.” They put on their first *malo* (loin cloth) and ate only with other males from that point on. Male visitors would eat in the *hale mua* with the men of the household, and likewise, the women visitors with the host women in the *hale ʻaina*

Women were forced to abstain from certain foods. Kepelino gives us an idea of what were *kapu* to women: “It is not right for women to eat bananas except the *pupuulu* * and the *iholena*...Women must not eat pork, the yellow coconut, the *ulua* fish, the *kumu* fish, the *niuhi* shark, the whale, the porpoise, the spotted sting-ray...” According to Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa, “For women to eat these foods would not only allow their *mana* to defile the sacrifice to the male *Akua*, but would also encourage them to devour male sexual prowess.” Many of the *kapu* foods were phallic symbols representing masculinity and the male role in procreation.

This separation had religious implications and was tied into the worship obligations and responsibilities of men. Although the relationship between gender and food is not completely understood, it is clear that the spiritual and ritualistic roles of food were integral even in early Hawaiian society.

* Probably *popoʻulu*. 
The affects of the 'ainoa on ho'okipa protocol are uncertain. However, historical reconstruction of the time period might provide some useful thoughts. First, it seems unlikely that men and women felt immediately comfortable about eating together after having been separated for centuries. Secondly, the abolishment of "high" temple worship in 1819 did not automatically affect the domestic practices of ancestral worship in the hale mua which was built upon beliefs of gender separation. The same might be said of the release of kapu foods to women. It must have taken a little while for people to get used to these changes. Throughout this period of great socio-political transformation, people still travelled between communities and there remained a need to entertain guests. At some point in the 1820s or even later, Hawaiian society as a whole had moved from gender-separated meals to joint ones which would have affected the eating location of both sexes, and quite possibly, the menu. Calvinist efforts to establish churches and meeting houses throughout the kingdom created more opportunities for joint eating and general acts of hospitality. The religious obligations in the hale mua were either replaced, or supplemented by Christian worship at that point. Some might argue that the subsequent disenfranchisement from the family land base, the diminishing dependence on district chiefs and the weakening of the extended family institution precluded bountiful access to food resources. As a result, by the mid-19th century, there would have been extreme poverty in many areas and hence, less food to offer one's guests.
Today, food and worship are still connected; many Hawaiian churches continue to provide a meal for the congregation after the worship service. Notwithstanding the myriad changes and influences brought about by the ‘ainoa and so forth, the traditional ideology of ho’okipa remained very much alive and intact well into the twentieth century.

Mea ‘ai incorporated more ritualistic and elaborate features when situations became more formal. When an important group of people assembled, a simple ‘aina (meal) became an ‘aha’aina, literally, “a gathering for (the purpose of) eating;” a feast. The ‘aha’aina often featured some of the great delicacies of the land and sea which were sometimes hard to get. Common dishes include pua’a (pig) or ‘ilima (dog), a variety of sea foods, a selection of greens, ‘uala (sweet potato), ‘ulu (breadfruit) and poi. There were a number of reasons to have an ‘aha’aina, some of them sacred, others, more secular. All of them, however, required a sense of responsibility and sensitivity to the code of visitor - host obligations.

The more popular term, lūau is believed to have originated in the mid-1800s due to the regular inclusion of “cooked taro leaves” on the menu. The use of the term lūaʻu gradually replaced the former aha’aina and its usage today is wide spread, largely due to the tourist industry. It is even entered in the American Heritage Dictionary, and is defined as “an elaborate Hawaiian feast.” Food distribution is a key aspect of feasting. Not only were the guests and especially the guest of honor expected to take home all of the leftovers,
but even the preparers of the food were given ample portions for their families. 37

Feasting was a celebration of food. Food was symbolic of wealth. A chief with a full hale papa’a (store house) found loyalty among his subjects. 38

To commemorate the fourth anniversary of Hawai‘i’s restored sovereignty after Britain’s 1843 seizure of the kingdom, Kamehameha III held a large feast at Luakaha, Nu‘uanu. It consisted of 271 pigs, 600 fowl, 500 calabashes of poi, 5,000 fish, 80 turkeys, 55 ducks, 3 oxen, two barrels of salted pork, and other dishes which reportedly could feed twelve thousand guests and the working staff. 39 Bounty is such an important characteristic in feasting that even today, to run low on food at a lū‘au, especially poi, is the ultimate embarrassment. It is always customary to prepare way more food than is really needed.

Again, Rev. John Paris comments on his first taste of Hawaiian hospitality during his initial visit to Wai‘ohinu, Ka‘ū in 1841:

...we walked single file some three miles inland to the house...prepared for our lodging for the night. Hale hookipa it was called, house of refreshing and rest...[the floor was] covered with a great number of the finest Puna and Niihau mats. Here weary and worn, we reclined and rested, drinking water from the the coconut and eating bananas...children came in bearing strings of lighted kukui ...then two strong men, tattooed from head to foot, came in bearing a huge whole hog, baked entire minus hair and entrails...calabashes of various sizes filled with fish, poi, potatoes; then came melons, bananas, and sugar cane, and little gourds filled with goat’s milk. 40
Incidently, Rev. Paris was accompanied only by Rev. Forbes—such bounty displayed for only two guests. The next morning, they were offered two more hogs, fish, fowls and various side dishes for breakfast.41

Large feasts before 1819 were probably attended largely by men, and might have involved some type of worship in the hale mua. Further, such gatherings might have included an address by the hosts, guests or other high ranking officials, as well as some form of entertainment. Hawaiians have always had a great appreciation for food. Eating has been described as “communing with the gods.”42 The modern li‘au is but a remnant of the more religious eating practices of former times.43 With the introduction of foreign goods and foreign ways, food and the institutions built around it were impacted. However, while the menu, company and occasions changed, ho‘okipa as a formal process and as an ideology did not.

Kuleana: Purpose of Visitation

One’s business, area of responsibility or the reasons and purposes behind certain actions can be referred to as kuleana. In terms of hospitality, kuleana may refer to one’s responsibilities and obligations in the ho‘okipa process. But its use here is intended to refer to the reason for a visitor’s coming. In formal situations, the reason for the gathering would be known to all involved. More spontaneous visitations might pique the interest of the hosts as to what would bring visitors to “their neck of the woods.” Visiting
family members might feel much more comfortable in communicating this information. Strangers might be more careful or guarded.

There was no particularly appropriate time to reveal one’s reason for coming. Nor was there a single golden rule that addressed proper etiquette in this regard. Everything was situational. However, it could be reasoned as good manners for the visitor to assure the hosts that he was friendly and meant them no harm. One very important way is by revealing where one is from. This may or may not be accompanied by an attempt to make links formally through genealogical association. The indirect question, No hea mai ‘oe? meaning, “Where are you from?” is a polite way of asking, “O wai ‘oe?” or “O wai kou inoa?” meaning “Who are you?” and “What is your name? If a visitor from South Kona, upon entering a village in Ka‘ū, mentions that he is from Miloli‘i, the Ka‘ū hosts would automatically attempt to associate him with their own family or friends who might live in or near Miloli‘i. If one’s family tree is recited, the challenge of finding links through common ancestors ensues. Often, if a link is found, the trust in both parties increases mutually, and may even be emotional if blood relationships are discovered. Some would prefer knowing the visitor’s genealogy right up front; others might wait until mealtime, or afterwards when everyone is relaxed and stories and songs are shared. Even in contemporary times, Hawaiians place great value on the establishment of links as a precursor to discussing business with a stranger. It is a way to “break the ice,” to establish rapport and trust.
After identities were determined, it was up to the visitor to disclose the purpose of his visit. He may choose to speak specifically or simply allude to it, or still, he may choose to keep it private. Sometimes the host could express his curiosity regarding the visitor’s business by making polite and indirect statements, but often withheld such queries at the risk of appearing *maha’oi* (bold and nosy) or *niele* (over-inquisitive and bothersome). Emerson writes in the story of *Pele* and *Hi‘iaka*:

> With a nice feeling of etiquette, Hiaaka’s [Hi‘iaka’s] hosts allowed the day of her arrival to pass with no inquiry as to the purpose of her visit. But on the morning of the morrow Malae-ha’a-koa asked the question that put himself in sympathetic touch with his guests. “I have come to escort Lohiau as a lover to the bed of Pele,” said Hi‘iaka. 44

Generally speaking, the visitor was obligated to mention something of his plans particularly since he had chosen to “burden” the hosting residence with his presence. Both parties were responsible for maintaining a sense of etiquette.

If people gathered for a certain festival or special event, it was usually understood why they had come, which may further suggest, who should be rightfully present. However, in the event that one’s coming was unexpected and the occasion is marked by considerable status and public attention, the visitor would be expected to somehow communicate the reason for his visit. It would be politically judicious to be up front in order to prevent or quell notions of what might be interpreted as hostile intentions. If other guests
begin to feel bothered or show their discomfort due to the unexplained presence of a visitor, this could be a bad omen and the cause of great misfortune. Some, particularly ali‘i, were very much aware of the jealous feelings of rivals or ambitious relatives, and they were careful to safeguard themselves against ‘anai (curses) and the destructive consequences of ‘anā‘anā (sorcery). A stranger’s presence was sure to raise the suspicions of the royal protectors if left unexplained, and a potentially fatal skirmish could ensue.

*Kuleana* is less a formalized element of ho‘okipa ritual, and more a situational display of etiquette. It is in many ways a “catch-all” category which identifies the need to communicate important information. That information ranged from mentioning one’s home village in casual conversation, to the ceremonious chanting of genealogical branches that are centuries old. The content and manner of delivery of this liturgy of information could determine life or death. In ho‘okipa situations, it played a very important role, and yet, its form was spontaneously dictated by the given circumstances. *Kuleana* attempts to describe the sense of responsibility that hosts and visitors display in establishing their identities and their intentions — it is fluid in form, yet so vital in the ho‘okipa process.

**Le‘ale‘a: Fun and Entertainment**

Hawaiians found amusement through a number of different activities. The term *le‘ale‘a* is a general reference to fun, joy or amusement. Within
the ho'okipa experience, to invoke feelings of joy, or le'ale'a through entertainment was a way of making guests feel welcome. This category attempts to capture under a single rubric the fluid, multi-faceted and situational practice of various entertaining activities.

Kiikahekahe means to “while the time away in pleasant conversation, jesting, laughing, and telling anecdotes; pleasant conversation, chatting.” While this seems like a rather mundane activity, it was through this loosely structured “family time” that young people learned stories and chants, genealogy, customs and so forth. Such sessions might happen outdoors, under a tree perhaps, or in the hale noa, the tabu-free dwelling where everyone gathered to socialize and sleep. Here, visitors might comfortably share a little about themselves or where they were headed. A favorite role to assume would be that of the kuku'i 'olelo, or “storyteller.” A visitor might be entertained with a story which might include a song or dance, or he might be invited to share a story himself. The term kuku'i wana'ao refers to the “telling of stories until dawn” which might have been a delightful activity for those so inclined. Such occasions were, no doubt, laden with both awe and laughter as clever word play, sound effects and animated gestures help to paint vivid images in the imaginations of the observers.

The performance of mele (chants often accompanied by dance) and oli (chants with no dance), were popular activities. Tales of ancient wars, the exploits of deities and so forth, were all preserved in the antediluvian
memories of the elders who would sing, and thereby teach, the epic accounts to the younger generation. A special song might be sung in honor of a visitor. Likewise, the visitor might offer a performance as a gesture of thanks to the host. Informal hula would accompany many songs or chants and was always enjoyed. Formal occasions might feature the talents of a hālau hula (dance school) who were often hired and maintained by certain aliʻi (chiefs).47 These dancers would perform their specialties; perhaps chiefly name songs, genital chants, and so forth, for which they were paid quite handsomely with goods and food.48 Accounts indicate that this was a favorite pastime that often went on for hours and was the high point of “festive celebrations of the Makahiki, or as entertainment for distinguished visitors.”49 In 1830, Kaʻahumanu prohibited public performances of hula. 50 Later, a license was required to practice it publicly and a hefty $500 fine imposed for violators. 51 Although the hula was at one time strongly discouraged, and for a while in the nineteenth century, even outlawed, it has enjoyed a rebirth since the 1970s. The hula, mele and oli, have increased in popularity and continue to play a central role in the formal hoʻokipa process today.

It was common to see people of all ages engaged in sport and games. Among the great variety are three in particular which were very popular and welcomed the participation of visitors: kilu, pūhenehene and ume. 'I'i speaks of two particular entertainment centers in downtown Honolulu which were referred to as loku. He maintains that such places were “known from the
distant past" and that the common activities practiced were, “hula dances, chants, the recitation of narratives in chant form, and the telling of legends.” Also featured at these sites was the playing of pūhene (pūhenehene), and one imagines, ume, and possibly kilu.* Visitors might have spent a good deal of time at the loku while in Honolulu.

Kilu was considered to be an aristocratic game that exclusively involved chiefly members of society. A visitor of noble standing would be encouraged to play. Players would gather into a large house, usually in the evening time; the men on one end, and the women on the other. Each group sat in a line separated by as much as sixty feet, facing each other. In front of each player was a “conical block of heavy wood” not unlike a pob in the English game of quoits. At the direction of the la anoano (referee), the kilu, a dish made from a coconut shell cut in half, was slid across the mat at great speed and aimed at the pob fronting a favorite person. Upon hitting it, the victor claimed a honi (traditional kiss) from the owner and the score keeper sang out a chant similar to the following:

\[
A\ text{ueue}\ ke\ ko'e\ a\ ke\ kae \\
Pūehuehu\ ka\ lā, \\
Komo\ 'ino'ino \\
Kakia,\ kahe\ ka\ ua\ i\ lalo
\]

So, the worm wriggles to the refuse  
The sun is tousled  
A contemptuous entrance  
Pinned, the rain flows downward

* Although I did not mention the other two games of ume and kilu being played in the loku, it is a plausible assumption made by the writer of this paper.
The *kaona* (veiled meaning) behind these words reveal sexual innuendos which set an appropriate tone for the game. Upon hitting the desired pob ten times, the victor might initiate a *hula* and the game would continue. Afterwards, the victor and the newly-won partner would go off privately and sleep together. *Kilu* was considered to be a “compliment to distinguished visitors of rank,” and a “supreme expression of hospitality.”

The game of *pūhenehene* was equally as popular. It consisted of two groups of people who sat across from each other. A long piece of *kapa* (bark cloth) was held between the two groups to obstruct their view. Meanwhile, one group would hide the *no'a*, a token, which was usually a small pebble or piece of wood, on the person of one of their team members. When the *kapa* was lifted, the other team tried to guess the location of the *no'a*. Upon reaching ten points, a *hula* would be offered and all would join in. Sexual interests may also have been an objective in this game.

Finally, the game of *ume* was played exclusively by the common folk. Descriptions of it include building a large bonfire and then gathering inside a *hale ume* (ume house) where the game actually took place. With everyone seated in a circle, the *ano hale*, the leader of the activity, established silence. Another man referred to as the *mau*, chanted and danced within the circle, waving a long wand, or *maile*, “which was trimmed at intervals with tufts of bird feathers.” The *mau* selected a man and a woman by touching them with
the maile and the two left for a private place to enjoy sex. A visitor would be a likely player in the game of ume; an extension of hospitality.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Le'ale'a} and its root word \textit{le'a}, have deeper meanings beside "fun" and "joy." They also refer to sexual gratification and orgasm, and generally describe the natural and unrestrained pleasures enjoyed through the sexual act. Given the sexual openness of pre-western society, and the implications made in historical accounts, it seems reasonable to assume that sexual activity in general would have been a part of making a visitor feel welcome.\textsuperscript{56} Fornander recorded, "When Aikanaka saw Kaeleha, he called him in and set food and meat before him and Kawelowai, his daughter. After partaking of Aikanaka’s hospitality, Kaeleha was ashamed, because he had nothing to repay Aikanaka for his kindness."\textsuperscript{57} ‘Aikanaka offered Kaeleha to have sex with his daughter as a token of hospitality. This was probably so in the ho'okipa process only because overt sexuality was an accepted social agreement of Hawaiian society.\textsuperscript{58} This is not meant to imply that there were no rules of etiquette, but only that such rules differed drastically from those of Western society; there was a very low level of anxiety regarding sex.\textsuperscript{59}

Historic accounts reveal the sexual encounters between European sailors and island women, and even Captain Cook was offered a sexual partner upon arrival. De Freycinet comments on the sexual freedom of Hawaiian women in the following account:
On the other hand, we can hardly accept as a substitute, let alone express praise for, the type of obsequious behavior, too repugnant for words from our point of view, maintained here in the name of hospitality. In all the homes that we entered during our travels, the people hastened to offer us the favors of some beauty of the family just as casually as one offers some wine, coffee, or tobacco elsewhere.\textsuperscript{60}

The ways in which guests were entertained by their hosts varied considerably but all had a common purpose; to make the guest feel welcome. These activities in most cases, were not special events. They were what the community did on a regular basis; they were part of the normal social fabric that reinforced societal agreements about what is valuable, true and important. Le'ale'a as a category emphasizes the desire for pleasure and happiness; an objective not only of the ho'okipa process, but of life itself.

\textbf{Makana}

Gift-giving ranged from casual tokens of affection to elaborate displays of wealth and prestige. The general term for “gift” is makana. Uku, which can be translated as “payment” or “retribution” was also used to describe the exchange of gifts, but did not carry with it in Hawaiian, the same connotations of the English, in the ho’okipa situation. Uku acknowledges that the whole of society depends on mutual exchange and that one should be mindful of giving to those who have also given to him. Another term that is used frequently is ho’okupu. While many erroneously define this as merely a gift, it is more accurately defined as an “offering” or “tribute.” Its literal
meaning is “to cause growth” and was directly related to the process of paying tribute or “taxes” to the ali‘i to ensure a good harvest. Generally, any gift offered to a chief is sometimes referred to as ho‘okupu, but never those which passed between host and visitor.

The key concept in gift-giving is reciprocity; the idea that by giving generously, you could expect to be treated with generosity by others. While it was bad form to express one’s desire for a gift in return, one had every reason to believe it was forthcoming -- it was a cultural agreement. Failure to reciprocate, or maua, was not only embarrassing but remembered as a shameful act for generations.

Gift-giving in ho‘okipa was meant to be a gesture of respect. Gifts exchanged among family members and special friends might include kapa (bark cloth), moena lauhala (lauhala mats), fishhooks, adze and other useful items. Prestigious or overly elaborate gifts might be overwhelming and cause the unprepared recipient to be embarrassed. It might also be perceived as hō‘oio, a gesture to “brag” or “show off” one’s wealth. However, among ali‘i, status goods such as feathers, whale teeth, special mats and kapa were common exchange articles.

Upon visiting someone’s home, it was always appropriate to lawe pū‘olo which literally means to “take a bundle.” A famous saying was recorded by Puku‘i: I hele i kauhale, pa‘a pū‘olo i ka lima, meaning, “In going to the houses of others, carry a package in the hand.” This refers to the
custom of taking along a gift, usually food, to offer to your hosts. It might be fish, kalo (taro) or even pa'akai (salt); taking a gift always showed respect. This was particularly appreciated during times when food was scarce. Upon receiving the heahea to enter one's home, the visitor embraced the hosts, gave them honi and placed the pū'olo (bundle) in their hands. The hosts might express how unnecessary such a gift was, but always received it graciously. Any serious refusal might offend the visitor. But also, it was recognized that gift-giving was a part of a larger cycle; somehow, everyone was either on the giving or receiving end at one time or another. People respected this arrangement, especially citizens who depended on the exchange of goods between those who had access to coastal and marine resources and those who cultivated crops in the uplands. In many instances, a gift of food might be served that very moment so that all could enjoy it. This practice has continued until today.

Among the greatest gifts to be offered was the mele inoa (name chant). If one had a name chant to offer, or even better, had composed a song in honor of the host, this would bring much prestige to the household and would further endear the visitor to the host. This might be offered as a heahea or performed later as pure entertainment. A hula might also accompany the mele. When special guests arrived, the performance of his mele inoa would initiate a tearful exchange with the hosts. Often, these honorific chants were referred to as lei (garlands) or wehi (adornment) in that
they "beautified" the honoree. The gift of poetry was special because it could be performed repeatedly for years, and in many cases, centuries.

The exchange of lei was always an acceptable way to show love and appreciation. Because it was inappropriate to place a lei around the neck of someone of higher rank, they were sometimes handed to the honoree in a pu'olo (bundle) made from ti leaves, or given to someone who might have more appropriate access to the noble personage.

In earlier times, lei were not restricted to special occasions, they were worn as desired by the individual. It would be common to see young people descending from the uplands bedecked in garlands after a swim in the mountain pools. Flowers, ferns, leaves, feathers, nuts, shells, even seaweed were all fashioned into lei in early times. Sometimes, people wore or took lei with them as they traveled in the event they were invited into someone's home -- it would be embarrassing to go empty handed. Puku'i recorded an old saying, "'A' ohe u'i hele wale o Kohala," meaning, "No youth of Kohala goes empty-handed." This addage refers to people who are always prepared with a gift or an offer to assist. The youth of a particular Kohala region, made lei to wear and to give as makana in case they were helped or hosted along the roadway. Lei is also a poetic reference to a loved one. Children in particular are called lei, possibly with respect to the configuration of their arms around the neck of their mother when carried about. Lovers are also described as lei as they likewise, are "wreathed" in an embrace. In both
welcome and farewell, the *lei* is symbolic of union and the reciprocal exchange of affection.

**Inhospitality and Impoliteness**

In Hawaiian culture, certain situations required certain behavior. To breach etiquette is to risk the loss of family honor and dignity. Shameful behavior was treated with disdain and remembered for years.

In Waiahole on windward O'ahu, a certain visitor who craved taro, was rudely directed to the taro patch to find his delicacy. Later after the visitor had gone, the host found that all his taro had been pulled up and cut into pieces. People were always mindful of their behavior and the manner in which it reflected well or poorly on the household.

To be inhospitable was shameful and such rudeness was remembered through stories, sayings and place names. People who pretend not to see an approaching family member, friend or visitor were described as pāweo meaning "to avoid" or "turn away." Traditionally, the island of O'ahu was sometimes called "O'ahu maka 'ewa'ewa" meaning "O'ahu of the indifferent eyes;" the people of this island are not hospitable, but instead they look to strangers or visitors with indifference. *Kalaoa 'ai pō'ele'ele*, meaning, "Kalaoa eats in the dark" refers to the people of Kalaoa in Hilo, who tradition says, ate in the dark to avoid having to invite visitors to come and eat with them.

On the leeward side of O'ahu, there is a place called Nānākuli, which literally
means, "Look... deaf." Because of the scarcity of water, the people of that area would hide from visitors to avoid inviting them in. If they were caught by surprise, they would simply look aimlessly about as if they were deaf. Hence, the name, Nānākuli; "to look around as if deaf."75

When Kamehameha I conquered O'ahu, the people of Kailua honored him with a large feast. However, they were not expecting him to bring so many people. As a result, the first group enjoyed the meat while the last group ended up feeding on the scraps. The pathetic image of Kamehameha's followers licking the ti leaves is recalled in the well known, yet, embarrassing phrase "Hawai'i palu lā'i" meaning "Ti leaf lickers of Hawai'i." While the details of this account are lost forever, there appears to be a breach of etiquette on both sides. The Kailua people should have been ready to feed all of their guests but were obviously unable to do so. On the other hand, judging by the number of canoes that beached along the southeast coast of O'ahu prior to the battle with Kalanikūpule at Nu'uanu (according to tradition), Kamehameha had thousands of warriors and retainers with him. He should have thought twice before burdening a single locale with having to feed all those people.76

In Emerson's story of Pele and Hi'iaka, the latter and her companions leave their volcanic home on an errand to bring back Pele's lover, Lohi'au, from Kaua'i. Near the northern village boundary of Hilo, Hi'iaka and her party attempt to cross Wailuku stream by means of a plank which served as a bridge. Two mo'o (giant lizards) who try to pass themselves off as powerful
sorcerers, deny Hi‘iaka and her party safe passage and threaten to harm them if they do not first pay a toll. Hi‘iaka, who does not deny their claim as her kinsman, calls out with irritation, "Hō mai ho‘i ka ‘ai, i ‘aina aku ho‘i, e!" meaning “Bring forth the food and we shall eat!” This is really a reproof for their failure to invite her properly. Again she calls out to them, “Bring forth the fish and we shall eat!” and again they demand compensation. Finally, on the third time, Hi‘iaka calls out, “Bring forth the water that we may drink!” to which she is denied passage for the last time. She then pursues them using her powers and “having seized them, rent them asunder jaw from jaw.” 77
The elements of heahea and mea‘ai are clearly discernable in this story. But if we examine more closely, even makana in the form of uku which is “reciprocity” or “compensation” by means of a gift or “toll” in this case, is also present in the story’s plot.

Stories of the fire goddess, Pele, are well known. Accounts, both traditional and contemporary, speak of her taking the form of an old woman, waiting to be offered food or assistance. If one fails to render hospitality, misfortune befalls him. As a result, contemporary stories from Hawai‘i Island say that one must always offer a ride to any elderly woman walking along the street. As Puku‘i recalls while explaining the value of right behavior, “Had not Pele herself, when refused food and drink by a selfish woman, destroyed the stingy one in a flow of lava?” 78
After being welcomed into a home, it was bad manners to stand in the doorway for any length of time. Instead, a person stood on either side of the door allowing for clear passage. It was thought that any obstruction of the doorway would annoy the 'aumakua (family guardian) who might choose to enter or exit at will.79

Among the most embarrassing moments in the household was to run out of food, especially poi.80 However, a visitor could discern whether or not this was the result of greed or true destitution. The consistency of the poi should cause it to cling to two fingers. If more fingers were needed, it had too much water and the hosts might be accused of being stingy. The hosts should never kahi (scrape) the poi bowl until the guests are done. To kahi is a signal that the poi and the rest of the food will be cleared away.81 Hosts should continue to eat for as long as the guest is eating. To finish before might cause the guest to stop eating before he is really full, out of respect.82 It was also impolite to speak of the amount of food consumed by a visitor, even in jest. A visitor must feel as if he is welcome and that his hosts are pleased by his appetite. Visitors ate whatever was served and never requested certain foods. To show disappointment at the menu or to eat reluctantly is to be ho'okano, or haughty; proud.83 The phrase, 'Ai i ka mea loa'a, meaning "Eat what there is," is a common reminder to be thankful for any and all food. Another phrase, Kani ka mūkā! meaning, "the sound of the lips smacking!"
emphasizes the appropriateness of making smacking sounds with the lips to communicate how delicious the food was. 84

In traditional times, everyone slept in the hale noa, also called hale moe, or “tabu-free sleeping house.” If a guest tried to have sex with the host’s wife, this was called pō’alo maka, or “gouging out the eyes,” which is a great insult. If a woman was offered to him by the host, the situation would be a different matter. 85

Hospitality should never be counted as a favor. Some people kept an accounting of how many times they offered their home to others, how many gifts they gave, how much food they provided, etc. This was called helu, or “counting.” To make reference to a past event was shameful and could cause others to turn a deaf ear in their time of need. 86

The goddess, Hi’iaka, upon leaving home to begin her journey, stood and said, “Kū au e hele; noho ʻoe,” meaning “I stand and go; you remain,” which was a common phrase for departure in former times. When it was time to leave, visitors would announce their departure plans. The hosts acknowledged their plans and wished them well, and might even invite them back. To ignore messages “requesting” departure would force guests to remain out of politeness, until acknowledged. 87 Once the visitor started to leave, the host must not kāhea kua, or “call back.” To leave after being called back could bring misfortune; hence the visitor felt obliged to abandon his departure plans and ended up staying a bit longer than he desired. 88
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CHAPTER IV
HO'OKIPA IDEOLOGY: SURVIVAL AND REVIVAL

A Historical Overview

From the outset, this thesis endeavored to illustrate Hawaiian hospitality as a cultural agreement, a requirement of Hawaiian society. *Ho'okipa* has been described as a mechanism for community survival; a function far more complex than mere acts of politeness. But what does survival mean? Are we speaking of simply physical survival? Surely, adequate food and water alone can meet these physical requirements. *Ho'okipa* involves much more than the exchange of material goods -- it is an attitude, a perspective. This strongly suggests that “creating relationships” to Hawaiians may have been viewed along with food, water, shelter and security as a basic human need: a requirement for survival. While Hawaiians had lost control of their resources over time, they still had the power to create and maintain relationships which enabled them and their culture to “survive.”

This chapter is essentially a selective historical overview. The writer will “overlay” the *ho'okipa* ideology upon different historical scenarios to highlight its presence in native systems and processes. Concepts and beliefs will be tested on occasion to explore the intricacies and nuances of the topic more deeply. Comments will be made regarding cultural loss, revival and
progression and the recollections of contemporary kūpuna (elders) will be presented.

It is important to understand that the writer is experimenting with this "overlay" approach which is intended to be a process-oriented exercise. Rather than submit to the constraints of conventional historiography, we will look metaphorically into the midden of events and processes in an effort to recover hidden assemblages of ho'okipa ideology in the stratified layers of Western historical conventionalism. Ideally, it is intended that the reader be challenged to look at Hawaiian history in different terms.

In Search of Ho'okipa

A ritualistic example of the ho'okipa process can be seen within the context of a ceremony which was part of the Makahiki, the annual celebration of the fertility god, Lono. When the ho'okipa framework is "placed over" this historical account, some very striking results shine through. David Malo says:

When the Makahiki god of the ali'i came to where the chiefs were living they made ready to feed it...and when the god arrived at the door of the ali'i's house, the kahuna from within the house, having welcomed the god with an aloha, uttered the following invocation: "Welcome now to you, O Lono!" (E weli ia 'oe Lono, ea!) * ...Thereupon the kahuna from within the

* "Weli" is an older form of "Welina," a greeting that predates the more common "aloha," according to Nathaniel B. Emerson, editor of Malo's Hawaiian Antiquities (Malo 1951: 154).
house called out, "This way, come in!" (Hele mai a komo, hele mai a komo.) Then the carrier of the idol entered the house with the image, and after a prayer by the kahuna, the alii fed the carrier of the image with his own hands, putting the food into the man's mouth...the idol was taken outside. Then the female chiefs brought a malo, and after a prayer by the kahuna, they proceeded to gird it about the god...when the feeding ceremony of hanai-pu had been performed, the king hung about the neck of the idol a niho-palaoa...the idol continued on its tour of the island...That evening, the people of the villages and from the country...assembled in great numbers to engage in boxing matches, and in other games as well...  

Identified in this account are several basic elements of ho’okipa: the heahea (calling out an invitation) is represented through the invitation to “Come enter!” The ceremony of hānaipū reflects the element of mea ‘ai (food), which is represented through the manual feeding of the god Lono, by way of the image bearer. Makana (gifts) are offered in the form a lei and a malo (loin cloth). Le’ale’a (entertainment) is experienced by attending seasonal boxing matches and games which are part of the Makahiki tradition. One might assume that kuleana (the business behind one’s visit) was made clear through the kahuna’s public prayers, and through the visual cues of the physical arrival of Lono’s image, thus marking the beginning of the Makahiki festival. Perhaps there are important links between the virtues of generosity/hospitality and bounty/fertility. In pre-Western times, the occasions for ritual welcome were ever-present. This might challenge or change the way we look at the Makahiki festival, and maybe all formality as a whole.
For centuries, foreigners have been drawn to Hawai‘i for a multiplicity of reasons, some of which stem from eighteenth century notions of the Pacific as a blemish-free paradise. European images of Pacific man’s “primitive perfection” (Rousseau’s ‘noble savage’) was textured with a host of other idealisms about island life, among them: the beauty of the body uncovered, free and unbridled sexuality, the endless bounty of land and sea, and the naivete of the islanders’ invitation to partake of all of the above. 2 Foreigners were impressed with native hospitality and on occasion came to identify and define islanders in these terms.

In 1778, Hawai‘i’s curtain of isolation was torn asunder by the exploratory agendas of Capt. James Cook. A symbol of British nobility and ambition, Cook’s arrival in Hawaiian waters shook the very pillars of island society. Upon seeing the “floating forests”* draw closer to the cape at Ka‘awaloa, the paramount chief of Hawai‘i’ Island, Kalani‘opu‘u, and his close cadre of warrior-chiefs and priests probably became both agitated and anxious, the way a host might feel upon receiving a special guest. Sahlins writes, “It was the most generous welcome ever accorded any European voyage of discovery in this ocean.” 3 Preparations would have been made to engage in a ritual of ho‘okipa, one befitting a visiting dignitary of the highest standing. Chants, prayers and dances were probably being rehearsed, and

---

*Upon seeing the them for the first time, many Hawaiians described foreign ships as “floating forests.” The line of a particular chant from the mid-nineteenth century memorializes this early native perception. E ‘ike ʻauaneʻi ʻoe i ka ulu lāʻau o kai, meaning, “Soon you shall see the forest upon the sea.”
some may have even been expressly composed for the occasion. A log account from one of Cook’s crewmembers says, “...amidst an Innumerable Number of Canoes, the people in which were singing & rejoicing all the way.”

The noble class of ali‘i were probably dressed in the finest array of multi-colored kapa, striking red and yellow feathered regalia and intricate bone and shell ornaments. Using strange gesticulations and curious routines, the inner circle of elite kahuna would not have bypassed the ceremonial opportunity to reaffirm their reputations as awesome necromantic mana-filled wizards. They would have engaged in orchestrating the ho‘okipa as if it were a kind of native operetta. Lieutenant James King wrote as Cook and a party of officers made their way up the beach:

We now saw coming round the Rail, a procession of 10 men, who brough with them a hog & a large piece of Red Cloth. they approached to where a piece of a wall, & the Scaffolding of a house which together, separates this part of the Area from the rest, & there prostrated themselves. Keliikea taking the Red Cloth, & carrying it to Koa, who wrapt it round the Capt: afterwards the hog was handed up to him....For some time, Keliikea & Koa kept repeating sentences in concert & alternately, & many times appeard to be interrogating; at last Koa let the hog fall, & he & the Captain descended, & Koa led him to different images, said something to each but in a very ludicrous & Slighting tone, except to the Center image; which was the only one coverd with Cloth, & was only three feet high, whilst the rest were Six; to this he prostrated himself, & afterwards kiss’d, & desird the Capt to do the same, who was quite passive, & sufferd Koa to do with him as he chose...

One gets the impression that the natives were “prepared” for this event. There seems to be no hesitance nor confusion among them, in fact, there
appears to be a sense of confidence, almost a premeditation which is reflected in the litany of ceremonies which follow Cook’s arrival on the shore. In addition to actions of deference and respect, food was also well represented at the event. One imagines that pigs and dogs were slaughtered and cooked in special *imu* (earth oven) for the occasion. Fish, taro, sweet potatoes and coconuts would have been gathered to create a spread of food worthy of the most chiefly of appetites. Summarizing various accounts, Gavan Daws describes the offering of food at Kealakekua:

A procession of natives entered carrying a meal of baked pig, breadfruit, coconut, vegetables, and poi. For fifteen minutes the priests performed chants and responses, ending again with the word, “Lono.” The awa makers chewed their pepper root and spat it mouthful into a drinking bowl. Cook and King tasted it and then a young priest rubbed the visitors’ faces, heads, shoulders, and hands with chewed coconut wrapped in cloth. When it came to the pig the visitors were fed by hand...as soon as he could Cook distributed his own gifts and went back to the Resolution. 6

Who would have thought that the litany of events that commenced on the shore, presumably honorific gestures of greeting, would have culminated a few months later with the apotheosis of the revered “Father of Pacific Navigation?” Sahlins asserts that Hawaiians believed they were greeting the fertility god, Lono. 7 Indeed, what a perfect opportunity to offer as tribute, the great bounty of the land during the *Makahiki*, Lono’s season of plenty. Obeyesekere, however, searches within his own Sri Lankan experience (spiritually and pragmatically) to boldly challenge Sahlins’ universally-digested
theory. Perhaps the priestly prostrations, the antiphonal drones of monotonic chants, the offerings of baked hogs and ‘awa, the “annointing” with coconut oil and the girding of red cloth were all elements of ceremonies indicating that “Cook was being socialized into Hawaiian culture” with all the due rights of a sacred high chief, and not of a god at all. Obeyesekere points out, “...according to Hawaiian beliefs, deification is a postmortem and not a premortem feature”; and of course, we do know that after being killed, Cook’s remains were ritually treated for deification. If Obeyesere’s counter-theory is in fact true, we might assume that the manner in which Cook was welcomed at Kealakekua included some features of ho’okipa protocol for a high chief. If we believe Sahlin’s story, then the protocol used may tell us something about how they responded to the arrival of a “supernatural being.”

Cook’s return to Hawai’i for ship repairs caused the locals much consternation; perhaps Lono’s return during the “off season” was in a way, a breach of protocol -- a visitor who overstay his welcome.

We can only imagine what was going through the minds of the native hosts as they led Cook and his party through the various rituals. The practice of feeding Cook by hand seems conspicuously similar to the hānaipū ceremony which is frequently associated with the makahiki festival. Symbolically, the ali‘i nui (paramount chief) fed the god Lono with the tributes “paid” by the people, which then caused the ‘āina (land) to become fertile. According to Malo, the hānaipū actually involved the ritual feeding of
the bearer of the Lono image. 10 This having been completed, the people would then engage in feasting, dances and games. It is difficult to say whether the hānaipū for Cook was an indication of Cook's god-like qualities or Lono's human-like qualities. Regardless of whether the apotheosis of Cook was of indigenous or of European origin, we can be certain that ho'okipa, which in this case includes all that was necessary to make "Lono" feel welcome, was an important aspect of the whole encounter.

With the advent of Western intervention came also the dramatic decline of the Hawaiian civilization. The susceptible native population which many scholars believe reached as high as 300,000 (but which Stannard estimates to have been between 800,000 and a million) 11 at contact, suffered greatly from the onslaught of introduced diseases. Lengthy isolation prevented previous exposure to a host of destructive microbes. O. A. Bushnell explains:

In that fateful year of 1778, explorers from a greater society "discovered" these islands, and thereby brought to their inhabitants many of the wonders and most of the evils of Western civilization. For more than a century after that critical year, the evils of civilization outnumbered and overwhelmed its benefits. The impact on Hawaiians was disastrous: their society was shattered, and as it died Death came for its people too, in many guises, which they could neither recognize nor combat. By 1900 only 29,799 native "pure-blood" Hawaiians remained alive, and the islands their ancestors had found and settled were no longer theirs to own. 12
When pondering the near "fatal impact"* of Western civilization on Hawaiian existence, it is important to consider how ho'okipa ideologies fared in the game of survival. Within the first several decades of contact, a chain of significant events severely undermined the stability and integrity of the Hawaiian culture. Whether political, economic, social or spiritual in nature, the relationships between Hawaiian chiefs and foreigners were often primary factors in these pivotal circumstances.

Warrior-chief, Kamehameha I, known also as Pai'ea, engaged in a series of strategic battles and created a network of political alliances which facilitated his move towards establishing a centralized government. By 1810, Kaua'i conceded and placed itself under his rule making the entire archipelago Kamehameha's kingdom. Within the brief forty years following Cook's arrival, the impact of foreign presence (i.e. firearms, trade, capitalism, etc.) grew. Kamehameha's death in 1819 opened the door for unprecedented changes. Six months later, Ka'ahumanu, known as Kamehameha's favorite wife, plotted along with her highly sacred counterpart, Keopuolani, to influence the naive boy-king, Liholiho, to share a meal together with them. 13 'This "transgression" of men and women eating together, or'ainoa, had, in one fell swoop abolished the centuries-old'aikapu and the kapu system --

*The use of the phrase, "fatal impact" is intended to refer to Alan Moorehead's 1966 work, The Fatal Impact: An Account of the Invasion of the South Pacific 1767-1840. London: Hamish Hamilton. His basic theme is that Western contact proved fatal to Pacific Islanders.
society's backbone of law and order had collapsed. Heiau were destroyed and images burned. The following year the traditional kapu system had been replaced by a new Calvinist kapu system with the arrival of New England Missionaries. Aligning herself with this new and powerful priesthood, Ka‘ahumanu proceeded to push Hawaiian society into a world of mind-boggling change.

Within the course of fifty years, as much as several hundred thousand relatives, neighbors and fellow citizens had died, the "national" religion had collapsed "over night" and a strange religion with its bizzare code of foreign truths had been imposed. Twenty years later in 1848, the Great Mahele displaced maka‘āinana from their ancestral homes. Their relationships with the land areas which they had nurtured and tilled for centuries had been severed. Access to the resources of the environment had been severely coopted. Clearly, the impact of the Western world was traumatic to Hawaiians.

Curiously, throughout this desperate period and beyond, historical accounts continue to make references to generous acts, and to spontaneous invitations to visitors to partake of what little of the "bounty" was left by the mid-to-late nineteenth century. Apparently, hospitality did not diminish even when resources did. That certain cultural agreements regarding hospitality had remained intact when much of Hawaiian culture had
collapsed implies that the concept of *ho'okipa* possesses qualities and expectations that are largely intangible. Perhaps *ho'okipa* is more firmly connected to the creation and maintenance of relationships rather than the goods that pass between parties. In addition, other concepts such as pride versus shame, and *mana* acquisition may also be part of the intangible, almost abstract nature of indigenous hospitality. We may further assume that *ho'okipa* has less to do with material generosity and far more to do with principle, attitude and disposition -- a spirit of giving. Contemporary Hawaiian Rights activist, Haunani-Kay Trask suggests that it was precisely this kind of natural giving spirit of the Hawaiians that allowed white foreigners to steal Hawaiian lands with very little effort. Trask would agree that Hawaiians had invited the *haole* in to eat, but did not think they would take over the entire house. 17

*Ho'okipa* was either unaffected by the introduction of Christianity, or had taken on new expressions under those conditions and within those contexts. In other words, even with the heavy impact of the Christian presence in Hawai'i, *ho'okipa* situations continued and maintained their traditional attributes beyond the church scenario. At the same time, customary *ho'okipa* behavior was also applied and used in Christian contexts and for many, became an indigenous way to express certain Christian virtues.

The *kauhale* (multi-unit living compound) as the traditional center of social exchange, including meals, was probably replaced by the church. The
nineteenth century community parish with its New England style halehawai or meeting hall, is still a characteristic feature of Hawaiian churches today. Ka Makua Mau Loa Church in Kalihi, O'ahu, has served lunch practically every Sunday for all of its eighty-plus years. All are invited to participate socially in an adjacent hall and to partake of the midday meal following the service. The same situation exists at Ka Mauna o 'Oliveta, a significantly smaller church at Waikane, O'ahu. Its humble congregation gathers in its rather quaint "hall" to socialize and eat after worship as well. At larger Hawaiian churches, especially those which are either more Western, more modern, or both, also feature meals, but only on special Sundays. Kaumakapili Church located at Palama, O'ahu and Kawaiaha'o located near Kaka'ako, O'ahu are primary examples. Their histories connect them to the early efforts of the New England missionaries and they are among the oldest Hawaiian churches in Hawai'i.* All of these places of worship maintain traditions of eating and socializing as part of the whole church experience. This strongly suggests that an indigenous connection between food and worship still exists among Hawaiians. Their forbears introduced ho'okipa ideology into the New

*Both Kaumakapili and Kawaiaha'o are Congregationalist churches. They are members of the United Church of Christ Conference, the contemporary version of the original American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions (ABCFM). Ka Makua Mau Loa and Ka Mauna o 'Oliveta are considered to be Independent Hawaiian Churches. Their founders broke away from the New England style traditions of worship near the turn of the century, to express their Christian worship in more Hawaiian ways.
England paradigm of worship over a century and a half ago, and today, the two have become a single construct in the lives of many Hawaiians.

To illustrate the syncretic union of foreign and indigenous constructs and concepts, a hypothetical ho'okipa situation featuring the elements of heahea (call of invitation), mea 'ai (food), kuleana (purpose of visit), le'ale'a (entertainment) and makana (gifts) will be overlaid upon what might be considered a typical island-Calvinist worship experience.

The ringing of the church bell would have been a cue to the community that visitors (in this case, parishoners) were approaching. The "church greeters" who would have greeted people as they entered the sanctuary, and the "Call to Worship" which consisted of a biblical expression of welcome given by the pastor, served as a kind of friendly heahea. Church goers might have contributed a makana in the form of lulu, or a monetary offering. Also serving as makana, would be the "dish" they prepared for the "potluck" * which would have been taken directly to the meeting hall before the service. In modern Hawaiian churches, the tradition of eating after the service is still practiced. ** This might imply that a traditional connection

---

* The use of the terms "dish" and "potluck" suggest a more contemporary situation. In other cases, the contribution might have been something simple like kalo or perhaps bananas.

** The writer's family members remember regular Sunday meals served immediately after the service at both Ka Makua Mau Loa (Kalihi, O'ahu) and Ka Mauna O Oliveta Churches (Waikāne, O'ahu) during the 1930s and through the 1950s. Recent visits to both churches in 1994, indicate that "meal traditions" continue. It appears that this is still a strong custom among Hawaiian independent churches.
existed between "food" and "worship," as in the hale mua, the traditional men's eating house where 'aumakua worship took place. Indeed, one's kuleana (business) for "visiting" church may have been expressed through prayer: the healing of a sick family member, the interpretation of a dream or perhaps to give thanks for a blessing. The singing of hymns and possibly the offering of an anthem by the choir (if one existed) surely possessed an entertaining quality then as they do now, and hence, may represent the element of le'ale'a. After the service, the entire congregation would have gathered to "eat of the bounty of the land." This would have been a festive family affair allowing for the interaction of young and old -- people laughing, gossiping and preparing food, children running about, etc. Upon leaving, church members would have graciously thanked the pastor for his "hospitality" and he would have happily "invited" them back the following Sunday. The collapse of Hawaiian institutions and systems during the traumatic early nineteenth century made the Christian church a desirable place to be. This kind of social interaction made so much sense to Hawaiians.

"Hospitality" is viewed by many as a Christian virtue. Matthew 25:35 says "...for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me."18 Christ himself, as well as the Apostle Paul were always afforded hospitality as they moved from city to city to preach. In their footsteps, Hawaiian church "prophets" and elders would often visit church members' homes throughout the week to pray, at
which time they too were received hospitably. A final parallel is taken from Hebrews 13:2 which encourages the hospitable receiving of guests, who we are told, "may really be angels in disguise." 19 This last concept is very similar to the traditional belief that the gods Kane and Kanaloa as a pair, as well as the fire goddess Pele, would travel about the islands rewarding hospitable people and punishing selfish ones. 20 Considering these ideas, we would have to agree that ho'okipa and Christian practices were quite compatible.

As time passed and the political tables turned, Hawai'i became increasingly less in control of its future -- less able to assert its cultual and political identity. The sovereign Kingdom of Hawai'i was seized against its will by the United States in 1893 and was subsequently annexed as a strategic U.S. territory in 1898. Native beliefs about the world and the way life ought to be lived began to diminish under the oppression of Western ideologies which dictated a different code of ethics and a necessary rejection of Hawaiian cultural agreements. As Hawaiian people continued their fight for survival into the twentieth century, they came to believe that their only hope for survival was to become more and more like their American colonizers.

**Cultural Blackout**

It is difficult to specifically identify a single event or moment in history which served as the proverbial "straw that broke the Hawaiians' back." There were many pivotal occurrences over the last two hundred years which served
only to bludgeon the soul and drain much of the life-blood away from Hawaiians. History remembers well, the high profile events and players. But perhaps more thought should be given to the experiences of the common people and to what indigenous cultural conditions were at the turn of the century and up until World War II. The printed resource materials (at least ones that genuinely reflect Native Hawaiian viewpoints) are extremely limited. Most Hawaiian newspapers, which are ideal sources for Hawaiian thoughts and opinions, are largely untranslated and sit patiently on archival shelves. Sometimes, and perhaps not often enough, we must rely on the memories of kūpuna, especially octogenerians and older folks who still carry the spirit and senses of their own courageous grandparent generation who raised them almost a century ago.

At the turn of the century (or thereabouts, depending on one's specific situation), what was true, beautiful and important in Hawaiians society, buckled severely under the corrosive and debilitating effects of Western imperialism. Previously, grandparents, parents and children could "sit together on the same mat" and effectively communicate using the same code of cultural symbols. All three generations sufficiently understood the complex cultural metaphors and folk ways of their society and could interact in and on their own terms.

At different points between 1900 and World War II, the "child" generation lost "cultural contact" with the parent and grandparent
generations. That void was then quickly filled by Western notions of truth, beauty and all that was important to Anglo-Americans. The fracture in the cultural lineage of Hawaiians was certainly inevitable from the 1890s when power shifted from Hawaiians to Americans. This is not to say that up until that point, Hawaiian culture was “untainted” by Western ideologies. This is most untrue. Hawaiians “possessed” (as Dening would say) much of Western culture since the initial arrival of Westerners. Rather, we must recognize that many Hawaiian families, for the sake of survival in an increasingly American world, had to push their children into a Western reality. This, in many cases, involved discouraging the use of Hawaiian language as a tool for cultural interaction, as well as the projection of new images of success for Hawaiians: in this case, speaking standard English and getting a good job.

Several Hawaiian organizations were formed with the intent of “preserving” the old ways. The Royal Order of Kamehameha, an exclusive society which endeavored to keep ali‘i ways alive, was founded by Prince Jonah Kūhiō Kalaniana‘ole in 1902. It was followed by the Hawaiian Civic Clubs in 1918, a maka‘ainana approach to cultural preservation, also founded by Prince Kūhiō. Hale O Nā Ali‘i, a Hawaiian aristocratic organization was founded by his sister-in-law also for purposes of cultural preservation. The two ali‘i organizations preserved traditions by maintaining them secretly. The Hawaiian Civic Clubs were more open and social. However, much of the knowledge which these organizations hoped to save eventually passed on with
the elder members. The loss of Hawaiian language and the pressure of foreign ways made it difficult to hold on to traditions. Today, all three organizations still exist and are largely symbolic. Since the cultural resurgence of the 1970s, they have been successful in promoting a certain attitude towards Hawaiian culture and cultural revival. Of the three, Hawaiian Civic Clubs have generally been the most active culturally and politically, over the years. The ali‘i societies are still well respected and are always proudly represented at Hawaiian functions.

Hawai‘i was controlled, both politically and economically by a core of haole elite, most of whom had missionary ties. The attack on Pearl Harbor which catapulted Hawai‘i onto the front page of newspapers around the world, and the succeeding events that transformed the Hawaiian Islands into a “Pacific military culture” during the 1940s gave Hawaiians (and others, like the Japanese) a chance to assert their new-found American-ness. The conscious and purposeful assimilation into American culture was a kind of survival tactic for younger Hawaiians who might have otherwise become imprisoned in a “time warp” of useless, unproductive and certainly passe lifestyle. Hence from the turn of the century, through World War II, the institutional support systems for “Hawaiian cultural living” had become largely disfunctional. Consequently, Hawaiians growing up between the 1930s and the 1960s experienced what may be called a “Hawaiian cultural blackout.” The 4,000 year-old flow of cultural information which had
evolved from grandparent to parent to child ever since the first ceramic pot had been shaped by a Lapita craftsman, had waned dangerously close to extinction. The result: nearly a century of culturally-alienated Hawaiians whose condition can be generally characterized by a low socio-economic level, poor health, a low educational achievement, a high incarceration rate and a high substance abuse rate, -- attributes which universally describe colonized indigenous people.

Many would agree that a society's institutions house its values and its ideals. When those institutions deteriorate, the culture loses its stability. Traditional religion collapsed early in the nineteenth century and was replaced by a foreign belief system. Before the turn of the century, Hawaiian was discouraged and formal education in the English language was required of all citizens. The practice of traditional Hawaiian arts was discouraged. In 1893, the Hawaiian people lost their political independence with the overthrow of the monarchy. Nearly every Hawaiian institution had collapsed: religion, education, the arts and government. The only institution left during the early twentieth century, though only partially intact, was the extended family unit. It was this last institution that kept key aspects of Hawaiian culture alive. Indigenous concepts of relationships and spirituality, for example, were maintained through family interaction at home. Even when Hawaiian language diminished, Hawaiians were still able to maintain certain customs and practices. This unconscious maintenance of Hawaiian
attitudes and behaviors kept the cultural continuum active. Overt expressions of Hawaiian culture may have been suppressed but cultural blackout was a "blackout" only in an institutional sense. Within the home, Hawaiian folk ways and lifestyle continued.

The forty year period from pre-war times through the 1960s was not only a cultural void, but also the heyday of tourism in Hawai‘i. This was a tremendous challenge in terms of cultural maintenance. Visitors demanded a different set of "truths" about Hawai‘i, and they were more than willing to pay for it.

Tourism: The Hospitality Industry

Hawai‘i's tropical environment and leisurely social atmosphere continue to attract visitors from all over the world. The land, people and culture have become commodities, each at the mercy of the world market and destined to be defined and validated in foreign terms. For a good part of the twentieth century, tourism along with sugar reigned concurrently as Hawai‘i's industrial monarchs. With economic growth badly needed and the availability of seemingly endless resources to exploit, Hawai‘i's tourist industry began its shaping and reshaping of Hawaiian images and perceptions. By this time, the ho‘okipa of former times had turned into a lucrative market, which demanded, not the thoughtful offering of fish and taro as its uku (reciprocity), but money.
The cultural blackout which was territory-wide by the 1930s to the 1960s, invited the world to manipulate native symbols and images to create an "outsider's" reality of Hawai‘i. Tourism and the inherent transmutations that accompany the commodification of the “paradise-ideal,” became entangled with native memories of how Hawai‘i and Hawaiians “used to be.” But the quick-rising visitor industry created a new kind of Hawaiian culture, one that was legitimized by “smiling natives, singing and dancing” and, which possessed the potential to attract both the rich and the famous from all over the world. The younger generation, whose ideas about culture were shifting during that period, were the new breed of Hawaiians who were ready and willing to promote a new brand of Hawaiian culture -- one that was slick, exotic and very romantic. They followed their mentors, the aging dancers and chanters of the last century, in the booming field of entertainment, Waikiki style. Among them were some of the great hula masters of the period: Kuluwaimaka Palea, Akoni Mika and David Bray. Some of the old timers had been trained in the sacred hula kapu (temple dances) with strict prayers and incantations to the hula goddess, Laka. Others had been court dancers for King Kalākaua. These people, some in their ninety's, along with their younger counterparts were head liners in some of Waikiki's top venues during the 1930s. 24 They were a “curiosity” and represented the “exotic other” which further exoticized Hawai‘i. In some ways, they were being used. Society was not greatly interested in seeing their knowledge passed on to its
youth. Aside from being taped and interviewed by Bishop Museum anthropologists, the old timers simply continued to make a living by performing their archaic repertoire of mele (chants) and hula for tourist groups and movie directors, and the cultural blackout continued.

Driving this overall scheme was an economic agenda which was instigated by the haole elite to boost tourism. One example of this is the creation of Aloha Week. While its birth was a business move by Merchant Street players, its success since its founding in 1946 has been because of the Hawaiian musicians and dancers who were only too willing to project the "legitimate" images of a more marketable Hawai‘i. 25

Unsurprisingly, the ho’okipa concepts which were ingrained in the native psyche and which were generally recognizable as “Hawaiian custom” by non-Hawaiians, emerged early in the twentieth century as a highly effective mechanism for the “selling of Hawai‘i.” Let us a final time, experiment with the overlaying of the ho’okipa scenario upon what might be considered stereotypical tourist experiences from the 1930s through the 1960s, the period of “cultural blackout.”

The lone voice of a “native” calling out “alo-------------HA!” is enthusiastically echoed back by groups of visiting tourists. This is recognizable around the world as a “Hawaiian” greeting ritual. Indeed, while Hawaiians do in fact greet each other by an exchange of the term aloha, it is without the over-exaggerated drone on the second syllable “lo---” and
without the smarting "--HA!" at the end. In a way, this is symbolic of the call of greeting, the heahea, which represents the first verbal (or melodic) interchange between host and visitor.

For most tourists, no visit to Hawai‘i would be complete without attending an “authentic Hawaiian lū‘au,” replete with pig, imu (earth oven) and sometimes even an imu-opening pageant. An array of “Hawaiian” food is spread out on a long table, or on the ground upon mats, and features of course, poi. Obviously, this is the counterpart of the sincerely generous (yet obligatory) offering of food to visitors. Constructed as a package today, entertainment (le‘ale‘a) automatically comes with the lū‘au experience. A popular show strategy involves native musicians and dancers “transporting” the willing audience back in time to “experience” the “ancient” Hawai‘i. Before the 1970s revival of ʻōlapa/kahiko (traditional or “ancient” style) hula, narrated pageants would often feature a story line that included exotic images such as a sacrificial virgin teeter-tottering between life and death on the brim of an erupting volcano. This was all part of the entertainment “game.”

In addition to the mystique of “creating the past,” vaudevillian influences led floorshow performers to feature comic hula dancers in the line up. Clara Haili, who is better known by her stage name, “Hilo Hattie” was Hawai‘i’s premiere lū‘au dancer-comedienne in the 1930s and 1940s. She would invite audience members up on stage to “learn the hula” which became a mainstay entertainment device. Later, the seductive girations and
liberal attire of female Tahitian dancers attracted a military following which inspired a whole new dimension in the "making" and "marketing" of le'alē'a. 27 When comparing the traditional manifestations of fun and entertainment with the WW II cultural transmutations of tourist entertainment, a number of parallels can be identified: dramatic storytelling (which was both romantic and humorous), hula, music, games (mimicking the dancers on stage) and sexuality.

The kuleana or purpose of tourists' visits is clearly stated in the propaganda of tourism: "to depart from the 'real' world by leaving one's cares behind and escaping to romantic Hawai'i, a paradise on Earth." Of course, the makana, or gift, is represented in two ways: first, through the traditional presentation of lei (garland) which is accompanied by a honi (kiss), albeit Western style. The other kind of "gift" which is brought to show appreciation to the "hosts" is money. Here, the fundamental difference between the traditional concept of gift-giving and the commodified one is that the former was a gesture of appreciation and the latter is a requirement based on dollar-for-dollar value. Traditionally, one would receive hospitality even if empty-handed, which cannot be said in modern times. Today, the medium for "exchange" and "distribution" among the "employees" of the "ahupua'a" is money.

In many ways, tourism is conspicuously reminiscent of the ali'i class at the height of social stratification: both have the ability to demand
tremendous amounts of goods and services as tribute. Tourism requires a "high yield" to maintain its "retinue" of hotels, shopping areas, entertainment options, and a staff of "specialists." Traditional ali‘i were obligated to maintain pono or a sense of stability in society by ensuring the productivity of the land. Likewise, contemporary society depends on tourism to provide economic stability which ultimately affects everyone in the state. When traditional ali‘i cease to be pono, the people suffer due to lack of sufficient resources. When tourism loses its balance, people cannot afford to make ends meet. That the capitalistic concepts and ideas behind culture and tourism were on the rise during the period of cultural blackout helps us to understand why many Hawaiians have come to believe certain myths about themselves, their past and their culture.

The Game of Image-making

Myths about Hawai‘i abound. The visitor industry is a massive corporate myth-maker which manipulates ideas and beliefs to create revenue generating images. Among the most popular and effective, are the "erotic female native" as a sexual object, and the "exotic native other."

The "hula girl" image reinforces the notions of "primitive" as being "non-European, pre-historic, as exotic, sensual, pleasure-seeking and rooted in the body." These very images are marketed by the tourist agencies through advertisements and brochures to create an alluring sense of the
“exotic and the erotic.” However, very few of these images are truly represented in Hawaiian culture. Some feel that the projection of “difference” is the key to tourism’s image-making. The performance of a cultural identity provides something for the tourist to ogle at, a kind of “voyeuristic” opportunity which generates revenues. Rooted in this display of “difference” is the native body, both sexually as alluded to earlier, and as a means to nativize, idealize and decontextualize the civilized present into the cultural “pseudo-past.” This is all an illusion created in the process of packaging culture for tourist consumption. Reality is bypassed.

The industry is concerned with “the Hawaiian look” which essentially boils down to what the market thinks Hawaiians ought to look like. Using the Don Ho Show as an example, “mixing well-tanned Caucasians with Asian-Pacific performers.... stressing that everyone grew up in Honolulu” communicates that this is what being Hawaiian means. Likewise, the Kodak Hula Show purposely projects posed images of Hawai‘i and reifies the notion of the “exotic other” -- the standard set of all that is different, and therefore exotic, and as a result, acceptable as “Hawaiian.”

At the same time, it would be naive to think that all tourists believe the ancient exotic imagery they are being fed. It is more probable that people in general choose to buy into these images knowingly. They are largely aware that what they are seeing is not “ancient.” Likewise, the performers and projectors of these images, many of whom are Hawaiian, are also aware of
their schizophrenic presentations of disparate “on and off stage” realities. 32
But people like to “pretend.” This has been so for people all over the world
from the very beginning of man’s existence. It is a kind of role playing where
audience and players react on cue.

There is also a more noble side to the “game of pretend”. Beyond
theatre, drama and other creative arts which are “legitimate” contexts for
pretending, cultural re-enactments can also be very meaningful to members
of a society. The Olympic Games, Christmas and Easter celebrations and even
the all-American Thanksgiving dinner are “re-enactments” which possess
elements of “pretend.” For early Hawaiians, the makahiki festival may have
been an occasion for religious re-enactments, the return of Cook-Lono, the
“stranger-king”* presents notions of “replay” and the canoe likewise appears
to be a classic contemporary example of that same creative tradition. 33
Perhaps notions of “tradition” are born from this need to connect with some
past entity by preserving its essence in the form of reenactments or
remembering for purposes of intrinsic gratification.

---

*Sahlins’ concept of “stranger-king” where, for example, Capt. Cook represents the estranged
chief who through ritual death and rebirth as a god, becomes “domesticated by the indigenous
people” is a “reenactment.” It speaks not only to the ritual cycle of birth and death but also to
the speciality of the chief-icon in contra-distinction to the common folk, their distance becomes
reconciled through the domestication, or possession of the stranger-king by way of death and
rebirth.
Cultural Revival

The Hawaiian culture was probably on its very last breath by the 1960s, not unlike a swimmer who runs out of air while diving too deeply. Gathering every ounce of spirit and drive left in him, the swimmer challenges what appears to be the likelihood of death and bolts heroically towards the surface of the water. He gasps and chokes and desperately takes in oxygen, until finally after the frenzy subsides, he realizes that he is going to make it, he is going to live. This is how many Hawaiians view the cultural renaissance. In reality, cultural elements have always been present among Hawaiians and would not have simply died so abruptly as the analogy suggests. There is a resilient nature to Hawaiians which is too often ignored. Although a bit overstated, the analogy is still useful in understanding some of the symptoms of cultural blackout. In some ways, Hawaiians were in fact “submerged” culturally. After that first life-reviving gasp of breath in the late 1960s, the Hawaiian spirit was rekindled. But was society prepared for this revival? How much had the “cultural rules” changed over the last several generations of blackout? Is the political confusion over images, knowledge, traditions, ownership, authority, identity, authenticity and self-determination the result of that “gasp of air” being too sudden? Perhaps a kind of “cultural hyperventilation?” Did the ho’okipa ideology survive these traumatic conditions? Does its survival really make a difference?
For reasons still not fully understood, during the late 1960's, interest in Hawaiian culture resurfaced triumphantly after generations of suppression. The post-World War II trend towards decolonization raised a global awareness of the effects of colonialism. By the 1960s, the world was sympathetic to a range of human causes, among them, civil rights, women's rights and indigenous rights. Perhaps society was now ready and willing to listen to the Hawaiian side of the story. This general acceptability of Hawaiian culture turned into a serious interest in cultural revival.

By the early 1970's, traditional hula regained its popularity and a number of hālau hula (Hawaiian dance schools) were established. Hawaiian language literacy became a tremendous priority which revitalized what many previously believed was a dying tongue. Calls for sovereignty have resounded in the Hawaiian community and have become mainstream issues in the local living. 34 Because it is unclear as to what actually stimulated the development of the movement, the “Hawaiian Renaissance” can surely be viewed as one of the greatest social phenomenons of twentieth century Hawai‘i. Some define it in spiritual, more metaphysical terms, while others skeptically wonder if such a thing really occurred. Yet, no matter how it is perceived, it is certain that “something” influenced the course of events for the Hawaiian people -- something seriously bolstered their confidence to reevaluate, for some, even recondition the way they think about themselves,
their homeland and their relationships with others. To some, the "decolonization of the mind" has already begun. 35

Star of Gladness, Symbol of Hope

Over the past twenty years, archaeologists, anthropologists and historians have become convinced of what Polynesians have always known: their Hawaiian ancestors had both the ingenuity and technology to engage in purposeful two-way voyages over long distances. 36 The humble gathering of brilliant minds and fortitudinous spirits gave birth to a double-hulled canoe of traditional design, the legendary, Hōkūle‘a. In the early 1970’s, there were those who were both skeptical and amused by all the commotion about a native canoe -- some were perhaps more fearful that the ambitious voyaging effort might actually succeed. Although the Hawaiian community as a whole knew very little about the scientific premises and hypotheses of the experiment, it was enough to pique interest in their Polynesian roots. Using ancestral techniques, Micronesian navigator, Mau Piailug from Satawal guided the vessel south to the Society Islands. The 1976 maiden voyage to Tahiti and back was a dynamic undertaking which once and for all proved that Polynesians were far more able and industrious than many scholars previously believed. The sail was a spiritual homecoming -- a profound pilgrimage to the past, and at the same time, a victorious progression into the future.
Thousands of Tahitians filled the beach area fronting Pape‘ete Harbor when Hōkūle‘a first arrived. There was great celebration in Tahiti as they recognized, not strange foreign sailors but the return of beloved family members. Upon Hōkūle‘a’s return to Honolulu, thousands more lined the beach area at Magic Island to welcome her home. A record album called “Hokule‘a” which featured original compositions describing virtually every aspect of the voyaging experience, was released and became an instant hit. Hälau (dance schools) throughout the state were dancing hula in honor of the native vessel. The heavy impact of the project made an indullable impression on the young and enthusiastic “cultural revivalists” of the mid-1970s. In a very short time, Hokule‘a became a household name.

By 1980, some ten years after the Hawaiian Renaissance began, it was clear that the brightest and most competent of Mau Piailug’s students would emerge as a leader. Uniquely competent and culturally passionate, Nainoa Thompson ascended the ranks as master navigator. His genius in effectively combining traditional and scientific techniques of navigation had set into motion a powerful dynamism that was both authentic yet progressive. Nainoa became a “hero,” a reincarnation of ancestral courage and wisdom, a symbol of hope. Under his guidance, the Voyage of Rediscovery from 1985-1987 which linked up a number of Polynesian island groups, and the No Nā Mamo Voyage to Ra‘iatea and to Rarotonga for the 6th Festival of Pacific Arts, helped to establish important cultural alliances that have created a kind of
"Polynesian consciousness" among Hawaiians, as well as a "canoe epidemic" among other Polynesians.

Sociology tells us that a symbol is a representation of an entity that is capable of communicating a construct of complex information in a brief and fairly immediate manner. When born from, or existing within an ethnocultural context, symbolic constructs tend to reflect the gamut of beliefs, values, norms and sanctions peculiar to that cultural context. 37 As Hōkūʻeʻa traversed the formidable Pacific connecting, or perhaps reconnecting Polynesian peoples over the last seventeen years, it has come to symbolize different things to different people. For many, it represents the common origin of all Polynesians, a confirmation of genealogies and traditional stories of migration. Others see it as an example of how innovations of traditional elements from the past can be meaningful in contemporary society: traditions, "re-created." Finally, most agree that the Hokuleʻa symbolizes the great ingenuity and creativity which Polynesian forbears possessed. This idea, which represents the antithesis of what Hawaiians and other Polynesians had been taught about themselves for over a century and a half, is potentially, the most powerful. "Competence" raises self-esteem. For most of their colonial history, Hawaiians had seldom been described as "competent," especially by white people, and particularly by scientists and academics. Embodied in Nainoa the person, is a premonition of hope and renewal: he is a symbol of "Hawaiian competence."
In addition to being a powerful symbol of cultural revival, the Hokule'a provided new opportunities for ceremonial encounters between hosts and visitors. Each landfall event called for some type of “boundary crossing” which required the necessary protocol and the exchange of ho’okipa obligations between Hawaiians and other Polynesians. Hawaiians were expected to respond in Kava ceremonies in Tonga and Samoa, observe certain tapu (restrictions) in Tahiti, recite genealogy in Rarotonga and orate on the marae in Aotearoa. In preparing themselves for these boundary crossing events, many Hawaiians began to broaden their understanding of their own cultural identity and continued to make meaningful connections with their fellow-Polynesians.

The New Zealand Maori marae (ancestral gathering place) system and the strict rules of protocol in the powhiri (welcome ceremony) served as models to follow in Hawaiian attempts to greet people culturally and ceremonially. Further solidifying Maori-Hawaiian connections was the unavoidable presence of the ho'okipa ideology in Maori lifestyle. The ritual calls of invitation (karanga), the generous provision of food (kai), the revelation of the business behind one’s visitation through oratory (whaikorero/mihi), the singing of songs (waiata) and the dancing of the haka and the poi which are very entertaining, the presentation of a gift (koha), traditional kissing (hongi), passionate prayers and incantations (karakia), the overall reverence for ancestors (tupuna), the respect given towards elders
(kaumatua), and the fact that they trace their genealogies back to the beloved homeland, “Havaiki” which is of course, is a cognate for “Hawai‘i,” are some of the reasons why Hawaiians and New Zealand Maori have “connected” spiritually and culturally in their mutual efforts towards cultural revival and stability. These new cultural contexts have raised the overall awareness of Hawaiians that they are in fact, Polynesians.

Notwithstanding these cultural similarities, there may be other factors involved which have further facilitated the bonding between Maori and Hawaiians in contemporary times. Hawaiians have generally become urbanized or modernized Americans, while Maori have generally become urbanized or modernized New Zealanders. Both do not share the typical “Pacific Islander” experience that other Polynesians do. Both groups no longer represent the ethnic majority in their homelands. They both speak English and have been dominated by Western cultures. Hence, they have come to interpret their culture using similar foreign terms and concepts. Both groups have large populations of urban natives who are well educated. They are able to communicate intellectually and can participate in global arenas, both politically and professionally. Hawaiians and Maori are experiencing a similar kind of cultural revival and are both aggressive regarding issues of nationalism and cultural identity. A final connection is that both were inspired by some of the same scholars who were establishing new cultural truths just after the turn of the century. Sir Peter Buck, also
known as Te Rangi Hiroa, brought Maori understandings with him to the Bishop Museum during his tenure as director. His research in Hawaiian culture may have been influenced by his understanding of Maori culture. Buck was also heavily influenced by Hawaiian scholars like Mary Kawena Puku‘i and Lahilahi Webb who may have influenced his own efforts in Maori research. While many Maori rituals and ceremonies are still practiced, Hawaiians hold the distinction of being tuakana, that is, “older siblings” genealogically. Hence, mutual admiration exists between the two which has fostered a unique relationship -- a special kind of affinity. These are only some of the ways in which Hawaiians and Maori have influenced each other. In terms of Hawaiian neo-traditionalism, Maori culture has definitely made an impact.

Within the last ten years, there have been more Hawaiians traveling to New Zealand and Tahiti than ever before. The “newly-discovered” Cook Islands are also growing in popularity. Cultural groups, athletic teams, exchange students, entertainers, business people and political activists are all seeking enrichment through Pacific cultural exchange. Pūnana Leo, Hawai‘i’s preschool immersion program, was modeled after the Kohanga Reo Program of the Maori. Top Hawaiian recording artists are now including more and more Polynesian music in their repertoire. Pro-sovereignty activists and nationalist groups have linked up with their counterparts throughout the Pacific region. And of course, Hōkūle‘a’s legendary trek from archipelago to
archipelago have made Hawaiians the world’s leaders in traditional non-instrumental long distance voyaging. This has caused many to cast off the passe stereotype of Hawaiians as “plastic Polynesians” and a renewed sense of respect is emerging for Hawaiians: their “family from the north.”

Symbols of hope, perseverance and unity are useful in learning more about how Hawaiians feel and respond to cultural issues such as sovereignty, indigenous rights, the awarding of Hawaiian Homestead lands, the return of ceded lands, Hawaiian language immersion, cultural revival, and so forth. When considering the horrendous effects of colonialism in the Pacific region as a whole, it is encouraging to know that native peoples continue to be inspired by heroes and heroic symbols as they endeavor to improve their condition, advance their status in society and reinstitutionalize cultural literacy and practices within the “neo-traditional” contexts of twenty-first century Polynesian society.

The Memory of Ho’okipa

Today, kūpuna (elders) still recall the customs of hospitality which they observed and practiced while growing up. They speak of relationships, respect and always offering what little they might have, to others. As stated earlier, Hawaiians practiced ho’okipa as a way of thinking and did not necessarily acknowledge a hospitable act as a conscious ho’okipa effort. Ho’okipa itself is a construct which has been identified and defined in an
attempt to understand the ideology behind indigenous expressions of hospitality. When the memories of kupuna are considered, it might be valuable to keep their accounts intact without pulling out ho'okipa elements, labeling particular actions or analyzing or explaining certain responses. Instead, their accounts can be appreciated as genuine and spontaneous ho'okipa ideology which connected them as a people during the best of times, and during the worst of times.

In 1980, Alu Like sponsored a conference of elders at Kamehameha Schools called, Ka Leo O Nā Kūpuna, for the purpose of identifying and discussing Hawaiian values. Many of the kupuna who participated were the inspiration for developing the Kūpuna Program, a cultural program sponsored by the Department of Education which is aimed at bringing the wisdom and affection of the elders to the classrooms of Hawaiʻi's young people. Often, before a word is spoken, their mere presence proves to be a valuable learning experience for children. While very little is known about each individual, their comments echo so beautifully the twentieth century practices of ho'okipa when they were growing up. At the time of the interview (1980), the kupuna ranged between 65 and 75 years of age.

Joe Makaai: When I was growing up, we lived in grass houses [Kaʻupulehu, Kona]. There were 25 of us. The guest house was in the center of the complex. When people came to visit, they stayed in the guest house and we children and our parents served them.
Pearl Kaopio: On Ni‘ihau we were taught to welcome the visitors to the house...My mother played the guitar slack-key style and all the family joined in. We made our own entertainment and we offered the same hospitality to family as well as visitors.

Lilia Hale: ....as children....those of us who were older, our task was to go prepare the food to eat. That was the Hawaiian way....If there was a chicken, for instance, we didn’t eat the chicken. When the visitors came I was told, “Lilia, go get the chicken....” when we prepared the food...we were not to make noise...we did our work very quietly. When they smelled the aroma of the food, they knew the meal was ready...we had only to appear at the door and they came to eat....That was the rule in our house. Feed the babies first....They ate and then the adults ate and those of us who did the cooking and washed the dishes, we were last.

When I was young, we lived in poverty. The table was so small, we ate in the doorway. When I knew there was no food in the house, I was ashamed to eat there in the sight of all who passed by, but we were told to spread the mat there. I would be ashamed because people who passed by would see us and they might want to come and eat....When I grew older, I asked my grandfather why it was that we had to eat in the doorway. And he answered that stingy people ate inside so that those who passed by would not see what they were eating. Those who were stingy ate inside but those were generous ate in full view of those passing by so that they could be invited to come in and eat.

Cecilia Kapuni: Before, if someone, perhaps a relative , was passing on the road, grandparents would call to each of them to come to the house and eat. And what was there at home? Sweet potato. And another time...what was there to eat? Just salt and candlenut. There was love at those times. My grand folks had salt, liver of the squid, chili pepper and some candlenut relish. That was what they ate.

Minnie Kaawaloa: We were taught to offer whatever food was available.

Theresa Malani: Grandfather would invite someone and say, “Come, come, come, let’s go to the dinner.” Oh boy, when that person came, they would come with six or more. That was how
it was at that time. There was wine, tea, well supplied with food. At the time, you would think when they were through eating they would leave. They would stay for one week....That was how people were fed. That is what I saw. There were no complaints, no grumblings. They were invited to come. Is it like that now? We act the poor ones now. From the second world war until now, the Hawaiian people have closed their doors. It wasn’t like that before. There was food, there was water, there was fish and everything. 39

When our kūpuna share their memories of hoʻokipa, they invoke remembrances of a by-gone era. Surely, much has changed and the contexts which made traditional hoʻokipa work are no longer present. However, many today believe that contemporary times are destitute of such social codes and that in order for Hawaiian society to survive and flourish, a cultural standard of behavior is essential. Changing times should not preclude the Hawaiian community from giving serious thought as to ways in which hoʻokipa ideology can be revitalized and reestablished. They have already demonstrated their ability to revive cultural practices with great vigor. Why should this be different? Hoʻokipa is still very much alive -- family traditions and practices have kept certain ideals intact over the last century. They need only to re-commit themselves to these beliefs as a community and then teach them to their children. As Hawaiians find more reasons and occasions to “act Hawaiian” along with other Hawaiians, there will continue to be a need for new or renewed cultural agreements to become established among them.
Chapter IV - Ho'okipa Ideology: Survival and Revival
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CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Thesis Statement Revisited

To say that gestures of hospitality are important to a culture is like saying that wind is important to a kite. That a society has developed a code of agreements regarding the proper way people must be treated shows that human interaction is valuable and meaningful to that culture. Living on islands required that relationships, both with the land and with other people, be nurtured and maintained. Some might agree that the development of visitation protocol might represent the height of "civilized" behavior, not unlike how certain genteeelisms are often the mark of sophistication in Western societies. The antithesis of this ideal behavior would be indifference, insolence or even violence, none of which played any acceptable role in the process of ho'okipa.

What would possess a people, who had no form of writing and who were basically neolithic before outside contact, to insist upon proper behavior among strangers as a social expectation? This seems to imply that the Hawaiians' proclivity towards generosity and hospitality was an indicator of a highly developed society. After all, they could navigate long distances, they could produce surplus yields of *kalo* and *'uala*, their skills and developments in aquaculture are unparalleled in the Pacific, they possessed a well organized
society as evidenced by research which suggests that the population could have been as high as a million, and by their being the most highly stratified in all of Oceania. Needless to say, Hawaiian civilization was highly developed -- ho'okipa gives us a context in which to understand the depth and breadth of that development. Like a kite is functionally defined by virtue of its reaction to wind, so is Hawaiian culture functionally defined by virtue of its gestures of hospitality. For without the mechanisms to keep them airborne, both would plummet downward to a most disastrous fate. Ho'okipa helped to maintain a network of civil trust throughout society.

There is every reason to view ho'okipa as an ideology. It is a way of thinking, a perspective of how life should be lived. Whether encounters were formal or casual, certain thoughts entered people's minds regarding the most appropriate ways to behave or respond. This was demonstrated at prestigious events such as a Makahiki observance and at the arrival of Capt. Cook, as well as during more casual circumstances, such as the persuasive offering of melon to a stranger walking along the road. They both reflected basically the same ways of thinking. "How can I offer the best of what I have to all who are present?" "How can I best show my appreciation for the generosity of my hosts?" "What must I do to ensure that I have more than enough food for everyone?" "What can I do to help my guests enjoy themselves?" "What is her favorite lei?" "What is his favorite song?" And so forth.
The elements of ho'okipa which have been identified by the writer have stood up amazingly well against a range of scenarios. This establishes their integrity as viable concepts and strongly suggests their worthiness to be recognized as conceptual tools in Hawaiian cultural historiography. Indeed, an amazing feature of these elements is that they appear timeless. They are useful in the analysis of traditional folklore and historical accounts but are also acknowledged and valued by Hawaiians today. Once again, this is similar to the timeless ideologies that pervade Jewish cultural history where certain basic concepts stand firmly over a span of thousands of years. If we reduce these elements to specific foods, materials, repertoire, activities and so forth, the ideas become less buoyant over time. As an ideology, it can conceptually bridge the Western Lapita Cultural Complex with the casual greeting practices of certain Hawaiian households in 1994.

Recurring Themes and Lessons

An outstanding theme in this research has been “connected-ness” -- the understanding that Hawaiian processes including ho‘okipa are really the products of centuries of innovation and adaptation. Clearly, early Austronesians dealt with some of the same complexities inherent in human processes and systems that early Hawaiians dealt with, and likewise for us today. The idea of a “cultural continuum” emerges as a way to understand being connected to the past and future without engaging in bothersome
squabbles over invention and spuriousness. Ho’okipa can be seen as an invention in that it has been “coined” by the writer as a construct of elements and rules. In a natural situation, the players wouldn’t necessarily say, “I am now engaging in the process of ho’okipa.” History began before writing was developed. Man’s physical and social evolution happened before there was anything called anthropology. The concepts and understandings of hospitality are as old as man. The construct of ho’okipa as formalized in this thesis has been invented.

Another theme is “boundary crossing.” Greg Dening’s Islands and Beaches recognizes the beach as the metaphorical stage for goods and ideas passing between foreigners and natives. The ways in which boundaries between insiders and outsiders are crossed is worthy of further treatment. Dening, in his discussion of beaches as boundaries, may have unknowingly crossed an ethnographic boundary in his attempt to view history from the eyes of a native Marquesan. If there is any fault worth mentioning, it may be Dening’s creation of a pseudo-reality in his work. This is caused by the fact that Dening in reality, is an outsider, not a native Marquesan, and therefore does not really have access to the native vantage point. This is worth alluding to because it tells us something about the nature of boundaries and the “rules” for crossing. Capt. Cook may have breached protocol when he re-crossed the boundary at Ka’awaloa. We too may compromise the fragile
boundaries between guest and hosts, and cause great offense if we are not mindful of the “unwritten” rules of *ho’okipa*.

---

**Parting Thoughts**

For a society to discover and settle the most isolated place on earth, and then to create and flourish in such an incredibly bountiful environment, the elements of *ho’okipa* seem so natural, so sensible. Reciprocity, in a way, is like farming or fishing: man gives to the environment expecting to harvest its gifts -- the more he cares for the world, the greater his expectation that the world will continue to sustain him. Clearly, the message of hospitality is less about man’s accumulation of goods or sense of politeness, and more about the creation of relationships. Man’s capacity to cope, create and be resilient stems *Ho’okipa* is about keeping people connected, grounded and always grateful.


